DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 914 80 EA 004 481

AUTHOR	Morphet, Edgar L.; And Others
TITLE	Revitalizing Education in the Big Cities. A Report.
INSTITUTION	Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver.; Improving State Leadership in Education, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	122p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Improving State Leadership in Education, 1362 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	City Government; City Problems; Decentralization; Educational Accountability; *Educational Finance; *Educational Improvement; Educational Planning; Metropolitan Areas; Politics; State Action; *State Government; *Urban Education; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*State City Relationship

ABSTRACT

This report is concerned with the problems and procedures relative to planning and effecting needed improvements in big city education and is based on the assumption that States should continue to be primarily responsible for education. Five authors discuss (1) big city education: its challenge to governance; (2) urban learning environments, opportunities, and procedures; (3) political and organizational dynamics in urban-State relations; (4) improving provisions for organization, housing, financial support, and accountability; and (5) developing a revitalized educational system. The five individual chapters of this document are cited under EA 004 482-486. (Author)

ED 065914

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REVITALIZING EDUCATION IN THE BIG CITIES

EA 004 481

IMPROVING STATE LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION
Denver, Colorado
1972

1

Arranged and Edited by

Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser and Arthur P. Ludka

Copies of this report may be obtained from the Project Office:

Improving State Leadership in Education

1362 Lincoln Street

Denver, Colorado 80203

IMPROVING STATE LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

POLICY BOARD

Donald D. Woodington (Chairman), *Council of Chief State School Officers,* Colorado* Commissioner of Education, Denver

James W. Becker, *National Education Association,* Assistant Executive Secretary, Washington, D. C.

Russell T. Gregg, *University Council for Educational Administration,* Professor of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Donald V. Grote, *American Association of School Administrators,* Superintendent of Schools, Manhasset, New York

Byron W. Hansford, *Council of Chief State School Officers,* Executive Secretary, Washington, D. C.

Emil A. Koehn, *National Association of State Boards of Education,* Past President, Parker, South Dakota

Wendell H. Pierce, *Education Commission of the States,* Executive Director, Denver

Mrs. Leon Price, *National Congress of Parents and Teachers,* Past President, Chicago

Harold V. Webb, *National School Boards Association,* Executive Secretary, Chicago

*Administering State for the Project

PROJECT COMMITTEE

B. Dean Bowles, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Roald F. Campbell, Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus

Jack Culbertson, Executive Director, University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus

Harry L. Phillips, Director, Division of State Agency Cooperation, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

J. Graham Sullivan, Deputy Superintendent, Los Angeles City School District, Los Angeles

PROJECT STAFF

Edgar L. Morphet, *Director*

David L. Jesser, *Associate Director*

Arthur P. Ludka, *Assistant Director*

Program Administrators, U. S. Office of Education

Harry L. Phillips
James E. Gibbs
David G. Phillips

Financed by funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505), and administered by the Colorado State Department of Education.

THE PEERLESS PRINTING CO., DENVER

INTRODUCTION

During the past few years, many speakers and writers have directed attention to the increasingly serious conditions in the big cities and have stressed the importance of proceeding without further delay to devise and implement appropriate procedures for effecting major improvements. Many of these as well as others have also commented on the acute problems of education in the cities and have noted that most of the problems of urban stagnation or decay and of inadequate or ineffective education are interrelated in many ways and that the solutions must also be interrelated. Numerous "solutions" for these problems have been proposed but, thus far, there have been relatively few serious attempts to develop comprehensive long-range plans, and only limited progress has been made in reaching agreement on goals and priorities or on strategies for ensuring that they are implemented promptly and effectively.

In the meantime, the number and percent of the nation's population who live in metropolitan areas continues to increase rapidly and the problems are becoming even more complex and serious. Within a few years, if present trends continue, three-fourths of the entire population will live in these areas. What happens or does not happen in terms of the economy and of the provisions for governance, for education, and for wholesome living will significantly affect the destiny of the nation. We can neither afford to continue with unplanned growth and developments as in the past, nor to adopt piecemeal proposals for changes merely because they seem for the moment to be "promising" or are advocated by influential groups.

The January 1972 *Newsletter of the American Institute of Architects,* for example, emphasized: (1) the importance of a national growth policy that would commit the nation to recognize the worth of the individual and his freedom of choice, and would concentrate on improving the present and future conditions of our metropolitan areas; (2) that the first priority should go toward improving the core cities; (3) that by concentrating on the neighborhood as the growth unit we can relate to growth and regrowth wherever it may occur; and (4) that an effective national growth policy will require broader perspectives and, in many cases, larger governmental jurisdictions, but with more citizen control and participation at the neighborhood level.

The present publication is concerned primarily with problems and procedures relating to planning and effecting urgently needed improvements in education in the big cities. It should be obvious that *educational renewal is essential for any significant progress in urban renewal* and that the kind and quality of education provided during the next few years will be a major factor in determining the gains that can be made in improving conditions in the cities. This volume is based on the assumption that the states should continue to be primarily responsible for education and, therefore, have an obligation to find ways of helping their cities as well as the rural and suburban areas to plan needed changes in education and to continue to improve their provisions, programs and procedures.

Since we do not have—and probably will not want—a national system of education, every state should meet fully its responsibilities for education. In our opinion, these responsibilities can be met satisfactorily only when each state: (1) develops and implements appropriate long-range plans for the continuous improvement of education; (2) establishes logical and viable provisions for local organization and operation of schools and relevant educational programs and procedures; (3) ensures insofar as practicable adequate revenues for all aspects of public education through an equitable combination of funds from state, federal and perhaps local sources; (4) provides the leadership and services needed to encourage bona fide local responsibility and accountability for, and in, education; and (5) finds and utilizes effective procedures for helping the big cities to resolve their difficult and complex problems relating to educational renewal—that is, to revitalize education.

Donald D. Woodington
Colorado Commissioner of Education
and *Chairman of Policy Board*

and

Edgar L. Morphet
Project Director

CONTENTS

Chapter		*Page*
1	BIG CITY EDUCATION: ITS CHALLENGE TO GOVERNANCE	1
	A New Nation with Veteran Government	2
	Dilemmas of Big City Education	9
	The Power to Propel	21
2	URBAN LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS, OPPORTUNITIES, AND PROCEDURES	27
	What Planning Tells Us	28
	Procedures for Identifying and Selecting Promising Alternative Practices	29
	The Involvement of People in Urban Education	31
	The Emerging Learning Environments	34
	Alternative Ideas to Traditional Schooling	35
	The Formative Years and Lifetime Education	37
	Constraints and Constraint Removal	39
	Strategies for Improving Education	42
3	POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS IN URBAN-STATE RELATIONS	47
	Constraints of the Past	47
	Change Is Essential	52
	The Emerging State Role	57
	Some Implications	65
	In Summary	69
4	IMPROVING PROVISIONS FOR ORGANIZATION, HOUSING, FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND ACCOUNTABILITY	71
	Some Important Trends and Developments	71
	Regionalism and Decentralization	74
	Better Facilities for Urban Schools	78
	The Crisis in City School Finance	82
	Accountability	89
	Summary	93
5	DEVELOPING A REVITALIZED EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM	97
	Forces and Factors that Limit State or Local Action	97
	Some Background Experiences	102
	Some Guidelines for State-Large City Action	105
	Alternatives for Resolving the State-Large City Issues	108

Chapter 1

Big City Education: Its Challenge To Governance*

This volume is concerned with schooling and education in the remainder of this century for some fifty percent of the American people who will reside in big cities—complex concentrations of 500,000 or more persons. They will be beset by problems and confronted by opportunities whose dimensions are unprecedented. What is done to surmount those problems and to capitalize on those opportunities will in large measure dictate what the United States will be like at the end of this century.

In these big cities, schooling with high qualitative performance on behalf of more than 125 million American citizens is a transcendent end in itself. But, it is much more than that. It is a means to help to redefine, preserve, and enhance the total nation as a society.

Americans have adopted, and doubtless will continue to adopt, adapt or invent, many and wondrous ways to shape the schooling they need and want. Much of their influence is exerted through voluntaristic, do-it-yourself channels—direct people-to-people interchanges. We cannot do without this way in the future; it is the ultimate determiner of what actually takes place when school and students come together. In their wisdom, however, Americans are increasingly coopting government—local, state and federal—as their prime channel for working out schooling to suit this new nation. These are, of course, related partners in a system of governance that has been called American Federalism. Therefore, the contents of this volume will be focused upon the roles, responsibilities, and relationships of federated governmental channels as they relate to schooling and education—especially in the big cities.

The fundamental intent of this publication is to re-energize and re-orient governmental leadership toward renewal of education in big cities. The "plight" of urban centers, and of the schools therein, has been widely heralded. So much so, in fact, that two dangers confront governmental decision-makers: (1) familiarity with the situations tends to dull the urgency of coping with them (considered chronic and inevitable, the maladies receive only ordinary, pain-alleviating treatments); and (2) only the negative features of big city schooling tend to arouse concern

*Prepared by *Laurence D. Haskew*, Professor of Education, University of Texas.

(the constructive opportunities present are not grasped, and their implications for the entire nation are seldom addressed with vigor).

The first task for this volume, therefore, is to stimulate supernormal attention and concern on the parts of those who can use the channels of government now to produce a nation healthier in 2000 A.D. than it is in 1972. The next section of this chapter attempts to perform that task—by showing that big city schooling is not a chronic malady but a pressing criticality. It is considered a criticality because it confronts the nation in the seventies with a choice between aggrandizing live opportunity or embracing deadly peril.

A New Nation With Veteran Government*

In the half-century between 1920 and 1970, Americans built a new and explosive United States. They continue to build it anew, with every decade producing conditions that spawn cumulating societal forces that make American and World society analogous to a stupendous nuclear reactor. Controlling and producing constructive energy from that reactor, while preventing explosion, are tasks bestowed chiefly upon government. American Federalism, although in constant adaptive response to these conditions, has been and continues to be hard-pressed to provide governance that prevents holocaust and harnesses stupendous energy to serve humane ends.

In this period of turbulent re-birth, that the feat of control has been brought off at all is a tribute to American governments. In significant part, such success as has been achieved can be attributed to what has happened to education. Over the preceding fifty years, state governments and then the national government have joined local governments in recognizing education as a first-order concern or priority.

In the early decades, elevated concern was applied to using education as a producer of energy for American society. Then, as the problem of controlling this energy became increasingly acute, another concern was added. Education was seized upon as a favored governmental device for harnessing explosive energy. In the past decade, when it became increasingly clear that education's own vitality was threatened by the stresses of America's new birth, governmental concern stretched up to renewing education itself.

Concern means "to become interested in," but also "to busy oneself with." Since 1920, all three governments have made quantum advances in adopting education as their business. Especially notable has been the concern manifested by the state and federal partners. The local government partners have, however, continued to shoulder the major portion of busy-ness. The quality and vigor of manifested concern has been, in

*Little of the content of this chaper is original with the author. For ease of reading, most citations to sources are omitted. Instead, at the end of the chapter is a list of works the author has found most useful in depicting the facts of life confronting big city education.

typical American fashion, highly variable. But three-partner governmental action has paid off in mounting societal energy, in avoiding holocaust, and in at least some harnessing of unprecedented turbulence to constructive ends.

In this era, Americans were manifesting an overweening determination to make their lives in urban settings. By 1950 it became clear that America's Big-Cities-getting-bigger were requiring all the characteristics of the new United States, piling up great concentrations of aspirations, energies, frustrations, opportunities, the good life, and the desperate life. Twenty years of living with that perception caused Edward Banfield to write in 1970, "That we face an urban crisis of utmost seriousness has . . . come to be part of the conventional wisdom."

The big cities now having populations in excess of 500,000 absorbed more than one-half of the total growth of this nation between 1900 and 1970. Their sky-rocketing magnetism attracted 35 to 50 percent of the forty million American families that were migrating to urban settings. These streams of new residents continue; population estimates for 1990 indicate that about 116 million persons will at that time reside in metropolitan concentrations with one million or more inhabitants.

These inhabitants themselves are in constant motion, centrifugal in nature. They move to suburbs at dizzying rates and are followed by business services and industry. The suburban rings thus created continue their outward expansion, absorbing increasing proportions of new migrants to the city, as well as those migrants from the core in the upper socio-economic status. By 1990, it is likely that 60 percent of the metropolitan population will be in the suburban rings—still moving outward. In the central cities, people are in constant movement also; individual schools often show 40, 60, even 100 percent enrollment turnovers in a school year.

In-migration to the central city has always been preponderantly composed of citizens in the lower socio-economic strata, placing great burdens and unusual responsibilities upon the educational establishment. For years, most of these citizens managed to climb the economic ladder and join the centrifugal movement out of neighborhoods of poverty culture. But, with World War II, in-migrating Negro Americans began to compose a major challenge to the inward-then-upward accomplishments of great cities. By 1970 the central cities of metropolitan areas with more than a million inhabitants contained an estimated 34 percent of all Negro Americans. For them, the upward cycle was not and, as yet, is not so open as has been provided to other citizens on the lowest rung of the socio-economic ladder. Added to others on that rung, some of whom likewise are penalized by ethnic labels, they have changed drastically the distribution of central city residents among economic and education-prone levels. While some central cities still have the majority of their school populations on second, third, and higher socio-economic levels, in many the reverse is true. In the lowest rung proportions are high and increasing. Surrounded with visible demonstrations of how much better

life can be than it is for them, these populations are seething with explosive energy. At the same time their very numbers and concentrations make it feasible to do the special things necessary to meet their long-obscured and neglected needs. They, and all of American society, are looking to big city school systems to do just that.

Customarily referred to by the name of an original magnet municipality–Denver or Detroit or Boston or Atlanta, for examples–the big cities long ago poured over structural boundaries. Multiple autonomous school districts serve their populations; municipalities and county governments galore make them a jigsaw puzzle as to who is in charge; overlays of other governmental entities further perplex the solution of city-wide problems. Ponderous, centralized bureaucracies thwart not only the operators thereof but also the aspirations of residents. Federal government programs further dishevel the combined efforts of local government to cope with the explosiveness of twentieth century metropolitanism. True, these combined governments embrace tremendous concentrations of wealth and other resources. The dynamics of metropolitan development, however, tend to disperse these resources ever more widely and unequally to geographic locations. Some school districts, for example, undergo in the practical sense great outmigrations of property and human resources. Others experience windfalls and, because their schooling is attractive, tend to pull even more educative capacity onto their legalized islands. For the losers, this is serious. Traditionally, the school district in a metropolis is expected to provide all of the community leadership and a lion's share of the money requisite for good schooling within its boundaries. With declining resources, mounting educational loads, and citizens who see that a historic district boundary line shuts them off from schooling other big city residents get, desperation mounts. State governments, together with the federal government, have made some attempts to provide financial succor to the losing districts but the urban crisis in schooling is outstripping governmental action. The same is true for almost all other energy-releasing, explosion-threatening aspirations of urbanized Americans.

Location of the crisis may be urban, but its impact area is the entire nation. It is now 1972, not 1920. Fundamentally, the pitfall we face is failing to recognize that crisis in big cities is crisis in the United States, and hence a target for all three partners in American Federalism. As always, crisis is a compound of opportunity and peril. The job ahead for governments is to aggrandize opportunity at the expense of peril.

What tools shall governments use? No single one will suffice, of course. *Neither will uncoordinated use of multiple tools.* The experience of the last 50 years, however, convincingly argues that *education has to be one key constituent of targeted strategies to exploit opportunities and to damper disintegration.* Systems of schools existing in big cities alone cannot solve any problem or exploit any opportunity composing our crisis. But, *it is hard to identify any problem or opportunity that will yield without key inputs from those school systems.*

Are the school systems capable of producing the necessary inputs? This is no place to try big city schools on the indictments brought against them, nor to attack those indictments with compensatory virtues. Viewed pragmatically, the stark fact is that—as systems—big city schools presently are not up to the job they confront on behalf of all of us. They need to be made able. They must become new.

The Local Partner

Local governments, especially the school districts incorporating central cities, have been painfully aware of these imperatives for at least two decades. Valiant efforts to meet them, although distressingly spotted, compose part of the record of the fifties and sixties. Most analysts agree, however, that *big city local governments did less and dealt worse with schooling during these decades than was thought to be possible;* the record is not comforting to America's faith in localism. Intransigence, ineptitude, paralysis, and lack of will are charges frequently found. However, analyses show that shackles imposed by surrounding conditions made it exceedingly difficult for even the most strong-willed to get at the sources of distress. In 1972, impressive evidence exists that the will, aptitude, and courage to do more and better is experiencing new birth in an impressive array of local governments for big cities across the nation. Evidence is also accumulating that shackles, wherever and however they exist, are more galling than ever. In short, *the local partner in federalism needs all the help it can get.*

The Federal Partner

National government in the sixties discerned and responded to the crisis, and a major breakthrough occurred. By grants-in-aid and direct action, it took steps—unprecedented for national government—to help. Compared to its resources and to the needs of big city education, however, the amount of assistance was and is small. The assistance provided is highly strategic and hope-arousing, nonetheless. Three disturbing side-effects, anti-strategic in nature, have marred the promising picture. First, wide heralding of "massive federal programs" has caused voters, activists, and educational lobbies to look to distant Washington as "*the* hill from whence cometh our help"—with consequent disregard for what Washington is actually doing, and for what it cannot do. Second, direct local-to-national relations between governments have developed to such degree that state government tends to be regarded, and regards itself, as a non-significant participant in the life-or-death gamble with big city education. Third, by the vagaries of federal programs and funding, the local governments in big cities have been further distracted from planned developmental efforts to cope with crisis. Other miscarriages in the national government's execution of its intent are no doubt legion. However, the more important facts are that: (1) the federal government is trying; (2) it does have resources to become a major bulwark; and (3) some breakthrough has occurred.

THE STATE PARTNER

Now we come to the third partner in federalism, the fifty state governments. The greatest asset of the state partner is the rising tide of state-level concern for all of education. A profile of the degree of this concern drawn across fifty states is tremendously jagged, but, for all save a handful of states, the 1970 apex is strikingly higher than the 1950 one. And a general upward mobility continues in 1972.

Contrasted to the assets, the greatest liability of the state partner is perhaps its "veteran" status. The propensity of veterans to re-fight the wars they have come through is notorious. Big city schools "back then" were privileged prodigies, and benign permissiveness toward them was enlightened strategy. The great problem "back then" was to get them to share some of their wealth with the rest of the state. Big city representatives saw state lawmakers as government for the "other" people, and as rendering greatest service when exempting big city schools from being state schools. For the big city schools, school crises existed in the rural and small towns. Supplementing their local property taxes to provide "equalized" opportunity in the rural areas was *the* funding imperative for the states. A state's education agency, regardless of brave statutory proclamations, was a standards-enforcer and help-giver for the weak (namely, the rural) and for those climbing toward educational prestige. Staffed almost exclusively by persons grounded in smaller-town life and thinking, state education agency officials felt presumptuous to pretend competence in sophisticated cities.

Welcome of state education agency personnel by the big cities was rare, and invitations to appear were almost non-existent except perhaps as protocol niceties. Presence of a big city superintendent at a state board of education meeting was as memorable as a visit by a foreign diplomat. The most potent interface between big cities and state departments of education occurred in advisory committees whose outputs were often helpful to statewide strategy but seldom visible in changes wrought in city schools. Live and let live was the dominant ethos of the times.

As a portrayal of relations in 1972 between the state and big cities in conducting education, the foregoing paragraph is a caricature. For several states it would have been caricature for 1950; in six or seven states it will be rightfully read as near-slander today. That fact is important and encouraging. Likewise important, however, is the perception that the features caricatured are still recognizable in current postures and actions of many state governments toward schooling in big cities, and their presence is considered a major liability.

That liability may account for the low use and/or misdirection of state government strength in capitalizing upon the opportunities presented by big city education. To be sure, state governments have come in recent decades to suffer from many new handicaps. In educational matters, however, they still have great strength. Some of it is exercised; some exists only as potential. For example, state government actually sets most of the parameters and patterns for schooling. Its power to tax, exercised directly

or delegated to local districts, raises 90 percent or more of the funds needed to support schooling. School districts are creatures of the state and are changeable in every respect by state statute at any given time. State government determines almost every arrangement for schooling—from how goals are set to how, and with what help, goals are to be realized. It is the arbiter, within the strictures of the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the judiciary, of how fiscal resources shall be distributed among school districts. It can—and several states have done so—establish state education agencies that are vigorous influencers and servicers of operating units; they, in turn, can choose which units to serve and influence, as well as the styles of influence they use. Citations of similar strengths need not continue further to underwrite the point to be made.

That point is grave. Only a handful of state governments are beginning to exploit and/or develop these strengths on behalf of the new locus for education's crucial action—the big cities. This is surprising, to say the least. The prime function expected of the state partner in our federal system of educational governance is to plan ahead for escalating relevance and achievement by schooling in each state. Yet, the story of the fifties and sixties is largely one of perpetuating arrangements and leadership developed for a bygone era, coupled with a few emergency improvisations to alleviate rising tensions in big cities. The means by which state strength is displayed—formulas for distributing funds, certification codes, and prescribed curriculum offerings, for examples—have turned up all too often as parts of the problem rather than as planned instruments for exploiting opportunity. Although escalating need for renewal, if not complete revamping, of educational provisions and methodologies for big city school populations was plainly evident fifteen years ago, few state agencies have directed leadership resources at this task. State plans for technical and vocational education have tended to be carbon copies, with minor revision, of those used in pre-urban times. When flow-through federal government programs and funds entered upon the scene, most agencies of state government turned out to be supine processers. Seldom was the great state muscle, bestowed by law or present in the opportunity to exercise initiative, utilized to turn flow-through toward flow-into; that is, to create and invigorate a new set of priorities for the state's endeavors in education. Among the fifty states encouraging exceptions to these generalizations are currently visible. More are in the making. But, the strengths of the state partner have yet to be applied as fully as is realistically possible in resolving constructively the nation's crisis in big city education.

But, what of federalism itself? The veteran government for our new nation is more than a composite of three partners. It is also the set of relations those three partners develop with each other. Even more, it is the concert those three partners arrive at in addressing the problems of the American people. As Daniel Elazar points out, this concert is not sought by parceling out activities among the respective partners. Instead, practically every concern of government is addressed by all three partners.

Such concert as develops depends upon collaboration—and upon collaboration that is developed *ad hoc*. When American people generate new demands upon government they transmit those demands simultaneously and indiscriminately to all three partners. Such has been the case with the problems of big cities; such is the case with demands for effective schooling conducted therein. And, federalized concert through collaboration has performed no better than partner-by-partner governmental action in responding adequately to those demands. So many analyses of dishevelment in federated strategy are common knowledge that elaboration is not needed here. As long as this nation holds to noncentralized government, considerable dishevelment appears inevitable. But the present degree is neither necessary nor tolerable. *The three governments can and should seek federation-through-collaboration much more vigorously than is now the case.*

Some think the route is a rational division of roles by mutual agreement of the three partners. All three would come together and agree upon goals for accomplishment (for each five years, for example) in the improvement of big city education in the nation. The federal partner would assume two prime roles. Through heavy investments in research and development, it would be a major generator of new know-how for reaching those goals, and for delivering it to operators in usable form. Constrained in its categorical ebullience by the existence of agreed-upon goals, it would use its taxing power to pick up 30 to 50 percent of the tab for reaching those goals, distributing the monies to states.

The state partner would have the roles of (1) picking up the remainder of the financial tab, of course using forms of taxation compatible with guarantees in the United States Constitution; (2) creating structural arrangements conducive to goal realization; (3) stimulating collaborative local-state planning for goal achievement; (4) exercising leadership in disseminating and promoting instructional renewal, obligated to make federally-generated and locally-generated know-how widely used; (5) assuring positive, accountable management for goal pursuit and achievement reporting; and (6) getting the fiscal and other tangible resources to where the needs exist.

The role of the local partner would thus not be dependent upon its capacity to shake taxpayers loose from their money; if so-called local property taxes are used, the state partner does the shaking. The role of local districts is to achieve, in their own territories, the goals they have helped set. In that process they define the real-life meaning of those goals for their here-and-now, with no second-guessing or "yes, but" from the other partners. They are the creators, coopters, and arbiters of educational means. Expected to be open to persuasion, and possessed of integrity and expertise at least equal to that of the other partners, they are responsible for results—namely, demonstrated achievement, nontempered by alibis, of goals set.

Most readers doubtless have, already, several quarrels with the formulations in the preceding paragraph. The writer does, also. Authors

of succeeding chapters will not endorse any single formulation, either. Thus we illustrate why many students of American Federalism are skeptical about the efficacy of general principles, proclaimed divisions of roles and responsibilities, and the like in producing concert. In our system, there is no rule-proclaimer, no enforcer of "ought," no delegator of duties and responsibilities, and very few sacred prerogatives for any level of government. The genius of federalism is fluidity, concert by mutual assent. Such concert—always imperfect—is arrived at around specific, real-life problems. It usually results when one partner becomes more dedicated to negotiating comity than to asserting prerogatives. That is, when one partner assumes initiative by being a persistent, patient, and persuasive agent for getting all three partners to agree to act in concert, using specific needs and occasions as the subject-matter. In the early implementation of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), for example, several state education agencies exercised such initiative with what are now generally recognized as beneficial results. For another example, in 1971 and 1972 announcement by the USOE of its Education Renewal Strategy is being responded to by some state education agencies with efforts to get the federal government, big city districts, and state government planners to build renewal on foundations already laid, rather than to launch another set of fiscally-starved fresh starts. Any one of the three partners can take coordinating initiative. To this writer, it seems that such devotion is peculiarly natural for state governments, but the major point is that federalism in government can itself be renewed to deal more potently with the opportunities present in big city education.

Dilemmas of Big City Education

The concrete, real-life conditions that characterize big city schools between now and 2000 A.D. will define in large degree what the new United States is becoming and amounting to. Those conditions are subject to blind "natural" forces, but also are modifiable by policies and actions of government. The time to begin modification is now. The conditions to modify are those discernible as criticalities with long-range import.

True, all education wherever located is confronted by criticalities. At some stage in almost every conference on urban education, a participant observes: "We are not really talking about urban problems but about all education; there's no difference." Such observations are valid, perhaps, but not pointed. In big cities, generalized issues take on specificities that raise them to distinctiveness.

Seven such issues are delineated below. They are critical. By no means do they compose all the criticalities in big city education, however. They are selected because government, especially state government, can make significant contributions, right now and in the future, to shaping the conditions that are spawning crisis. We state the criticalities in

dilemma form; each is depicted as a tug-of-war between opportunity and peril.

Quality Education Amidst the Process of Ethnic Desegregation of Schools

High quality education for everybody is a persistent American dream. School districts exist to fulfill that dream. "Everybody" is an important stipulation. The ultimate criterion, however, is "high quality." Big city districts have a tough assignment, at best, in responding to that criterion. The meaning-content of high quality for them is exceedingly complex. But, the opportunities before them are legion. With the insights and technologies now available, it is possible to frame and pursue goals that would give us a sorely-needed new manifestation of "high quality" relevant to the world ahead. With that opportunity at hand, the process of seizing it would seem to be of first moment.

Another process, however, is clamoring for every moment available. It is the process of ethnic desegregation and integration of schools. The Constitution of the United States, being modulated and directed through federal courts and the executive branch of the federal government, is making obsolete almost every traditional and established arrangement for achieving educational goals. The pain created is almost unprecedented; its degree in big cities is exponentially more acute than in the average run of school districts. Between 1960 and 1970 the population of Negroes in central cities rose from 6.4 million to 13 million; estimates indicate that 75 to 80 percent of all Negroes will probably reside in metropolitan areas by 1975. Segregation of ethnic populations by locations of residence has increased in similar proportions; city schools are dealing with 100 square-mile expanses of monoethnicity, and segregation-by-school-district continues to thwart the constitutional imperatives deemed to exist by the United States Supreme Court. The process and experiences of desegregation of schools is shaking the foundations for pursuing quality education in big cities. Words are pale in denoting the casualties occurring. Casualties in:

- Viable governance,
- The deployment of energy and manpower,
- The aspects of schooling preoccupying professional staffs and boards of education,
- Fiscal resources and their utilization,
- Staffing,
- School district structure for the metropolis,
- Time and talent available for curriculum renewal,
- Acts and technologies for teaching and learning,
- Planmaking for upward development,
- Supportive assistance from other governmental programs such as housing, urban renewal and model neighborhoods, and

- In that one essential for success in educating people on a frame of localism—ideological commitment and emotional support from the community for its schooling organization.

Let us be crystal-clear here. Achievement of desegregation and integration relationships is not the peril. Its methodologies may be influenced over time toward less mechanical, simplistic, and naive strategies. But, that achievement has—by right and by inevitability—to be with us for the remainder of this century. The peril is failure to create foundations for pursuing *quality* that can withstand or lessen the impact of the processes for achieving ethnic equity. Almost every foundation named above can be shored up or recreated by state government; fiscal resources and what those resources can be used for are, for example, functions of state government action. The federal government, local governments, and particularly the concerted federation of all governments have important roles also in maintaining the conditions for achieving a quality of education worth giving everybody access to. Subsequent chapters will elaborate upon some of those roles.

New Visions Amidst Massive Concentrations of Previously Bypassed People

Everybody can and should acquire education that opens to them, as consumers and producers, America's constantly reformulated brands of the good life. That is the vision. It is no longer a pipe-dream. Technologies, political feasibilities, and economic arrangements are moving it toward a realizable expectation. But, when one talks this way about educating people, people cannot be designated by headcount statistics. Educational loads have to be counted in persons plus the assistance each requires in wanting, seeking, and acquiring education compatible with the vision expressed. For years, headcount fixations by state and local government have contributed to bypassing lots and lots of persons. Particularly vulnerable were those whose societal and cultural heredity, experiences with everyday life, and schooling's own ineptitudes fitted poorly with "equal opportunity for every headcount" treatment. Scattered as small percentages of the headcounts in thousands of school districts, they generated worry, but too little concern to make much headway toward being part of everybody. Today, though, these persons compose massive proportions of the educational load in big cities. We no longer have the alibi of "not enough to justify the cost of special treatment," nor the dream-world luxury of presuming they are noncrucial in the United States. In fact, their presence has spawned the new vision for education.

Much recent literature pictures as pure doom the presence of these people in big city school systems. The theme song seems to be that the systems are as hopeless as the persons. We cannot agree. Opportunity is far more present than doom. Awakening systems are numerous; promising technologies are coming into play; departures from outmoded forms and attitudes are evident; concerted community effort is a-borning. And, many people are responding.

Much remains to be invented. Much more, already invented, needs to be applied. We know by now that no magic incantation exists as a

palliative for all problems; that the road ahead is not the Daytona Speedway. What is needed most is resources—resources that lie in the technical and willful capacities of the educative establishment to conquer the job ahead; in multi-agency coordinated concentrations designed to meet the career needs of bypassed persons; and in available dollars that will much more closely match the extraordinary costs of education. Even considering the practical political and economic constraints, it is still possible that state governments can make marked contributions to each type of resource.

Planning Toward the Future Amidst Immediate Emergencies

Little need exists to document the daily brinksmanship that constitutes operation of big city schools. Most brinks are edges of cave-ins from past or present floods, however. As a consequence, the future is accorded importance but scant attention.

The major actor in the choice of brinksmanship or futuremanship is the state; it lives in repetitive emergency itself. State governments are perpetuating school district structure in metropolitan areas as if the year is 1940, not 1972. The absence of long-range planning now almost decrees that district-by-district planning will still be the mode ten years hence—and big city problems with migratory escapism and disparity of opportunity will be intensified. By contrast, a few states are planning ahead to relieve dependence upon local property taxes for meeting the "extra" needs of big cities; acceleration of such planning can alleviate some central city financial anemia in the future.

These two examples seek to extol future-oriented planning by state government. It can give some answers to crucial questions confronting the state's education in big cities: How shall educational need be measured in foundation program systems for school support? Shall occupational education offerings be quickly amenable to forthcoming employment patterns, or must they still be "ordered" from out-of-date catalogs and made available only on no-risk basis? How will the state education agency be staffed and with what capacity shall it be equipped, since we *do* have big cities? What shall "instructional materials" mean ten years hence? The hardware and software required for education in 1980—will we provide it, shoestring it, or just hope somebody else will donate it? Shall the state just patch the emergencies and leave planning for the emergent to local and national governments? Finding the time and making an effort to answer such future-oriented questions is not easy. But, it does aggrandize the opportunity end of the dilemma if state government so chooses.

Planning ahead by school districts in big cities does occur, in spite of brinksmanship. Its outputs merit more commendation than they get, perhaps. One flaw—not attributable solely to those charged with the responsibility for school district governance—mars most of it. *That flaw is projecting past and present into the future.* Plans for school site acquisition continue to follow the flow of new residences, instead of the

necessity for desegregating socio-economic classes, for example. School plant planning provides goodies for the mobile, but only left-overs for the immobilized. The percentage distribution of future-planned budgeted expenditures remains nearly constant, as if transportation, multimedia instruction, computers, individualized ministry to learners, and other operations of similar portent cannot touch that sacred allocation for professional salaries.

Such flaws, however, are not the crux of the situation. The crux is the absence of priority-targeted, development-span planmaking. Few changes in the practice, or the products, of schooling can be made in less than a five-year span of carefully-planned, developmental installation of the devices to produce the change. A span so short assumes the device itself (*e.g.*, the Multi-Unit Elementary School) is already fairly perfected; if devices have to be invented, add 3 to 5 years. Yet, big city schooling must change—in practice and in products. Perilous indeed is continued absence of planning to assure that by a certain time at least a few changes—chosen because they have high priority—will be measurably accomplished. To be sure, an imperative for developmental planmaking confronts all school districts, small or large. What makes the big city different is the daily fare of major emergencies pressing upon top management, plus the great weight of a layered bureaucracy pressing toward continuation and expansion of the customary yesterdays. To provide for developmental planning, and then for execution of the plans made, is exceedingly difficult. However, a few beacon cities are showing it can be done in a few areas of concern. Their experience indicates that the first requisite is a leadership and support staff set up to give *priority to imperatives,* rather than to emergencies and to persistencies. That takes will and it takes money. The second requisite is prodding from outside the district—prodding by requirements and requests, prodding by incentives, prodding by resources in talent and facilities made available.

What can governments do to accelerate achievement-by-design? Each level can employ more conscientious birth control with respect to emergencies; a high proportion of present emergencies are the offspring of governmental impulsiveness or obtuseness. Local government can adopt parallel top priorities and stick to them. State and federal governments can furnish striking impulsions and propulsions for the practice of developmental planmaking.

Accountability Amidst Deterrents

The current push for accountability—whether mandated or voluntarily assumed—holds great promise for renewal of important segments of the schooling that Americans rely upon local districts to give. This is because it attempts to raise to first attention the achievements of students, all of them, as indicators of faithful stewardship. Products instead of provisions alone are to be accounted for to the multiple public and governmental investors in schooling. Since *organizations tend to pass the tests they know they will be given* (witness, for example, the recent achievements of major corporations in reducing pollution), it is reasoned

that accountability for results will spawn in school systems higher productivity in sheer learning. Therefore, *product accountability is not an end in itself, but a strategy for escalating success by pupils in some segments of school endeavor.* As a strategy, the push for product accountability probably has as much promise for rejuvenating big city education as anything else on the horizon. Big city governing boards and administrators eye it wistfully, if quizzically.

However, the degree of promise present in accountability strategy is nearly matched by degrees of difficulty inherent in implementation of that strategy. For example, current efforts by the federal government and by state legislatures to proclaim accountability *instanter* are resulting in a degree of mere tokenism that can prostitute the basic concept. For another example, experience to date indicates that installation of accountability has to be a long-term, developmental, incremental, patient endeavor; *instant "success" and universality are neither possible nor desirable.* Other very real difficulties and value-resolutions abound, common to all school districts as mandated or voluntary steps toward product accountability are undertaken. State and federal governments have significant roles in surmounting these difficulties, and particularly so in steering clear of increasing them. Big city districts confront these common difficulties. They also confront unique deterrents. A few are singled out.

Big city school districts are characterized by organization structures creating tremendous distances between the governance level and the schoolrooms. Layer upon layer of communication and execution arrangements tend to filter out the spirit of any idea such as accountability—that spirit being "these children I teach shall learn, every one of them." Reorganization of big city districts to get their work done is clearly crucial to making accountability a reality. Even then, however, unless state and federal governments recognize and make provision for the unusual resources required for innovation in contexts of such massiveness, true product accountability is not likely to ensue. Instead, it can be prostituted by the 3R's of bureaucracy—regulations, routines, and reports.

Unions of employees are strongest in big city locales. They take stances, employ powerful sanctions, and negotiate contracts that channel ever-larger proportions of all fiscal resources into wages and that guarantee "working conditions" conducive to employee welfare. The condition of employee accountability for results in every-student learning, however, is seldom addressed, and if so usually as a "no-no." Backed by their absentee, non-accountable landlords, the national association or federation-employee unions claim the right to be co-governors with school boards of public school systems (a right this author champions). *But, so far, they have not been willing to pay the price for that right,* the price of accountable responsibility for the results in pupil achievement they produce. Instead, they typically take a dim and distant view of the accountability strategy, arguing that scores of other conditions must be settled first. In short, without some in-course corrections of current trends in negotiated contracts with educators' unions it is nearly impossible to

hold big city local school government accountable for schooling's results. Can such corrections occur? Some hope professionalism will soon re-assert itself in educators' bargaining units. Others advocate transferring, by law, to state-legislature levels all collective negotiations for employee rewards, benefits, and prerequisites. Still others point out that the rules of the negotiation game are made, in ultimate, by state and federal government agencies—agencies attentive to lobbies and political sanctions to be sure, but also presumably attentive to the well-being of all the people including children. And, in some cities at least, concerned parents are beginning organized efforts to counter the power of educators' unions with political power.

Technology, technical assistance, and supportive services do not constitute accountability but they are the backbone of any stalwart effort to implement the strategy over long range. A shoestring is a poor backbone, but—relative to the size of the task at hand—that's about all big city school districts are able to use today. Here is one condition, for sure, that is amenable to action by state and federal government. Development of technology, direct provision of pools of technical assistance whose use has no dependence upon the local district's budget or project funds, full operation of electronic data processing and data production (*e. g.,* by test instruments) services—these appear to be avenues state government (with financial assistance from federal taxes) can use with attractive pay-off in backboning accountability.

In the pupil populations ministered to by big school districts are tremendous contingents of those whose "failure" has shocked the nation, large contingents of learners whose customary achievements are satisfying, and others whose success is comparatively normal but distressing because it falls far short of what their gifts make possible. Establishing the same criteria for the level to be reached by these highly variant customers at the end of each year is manifestly barbarian; it sets certain failure as the outcome for many schools and classes and individuals while passing out kudos for minimal effort by others. Neither can it be contemplated that accountability criteria are useful when stated as whole-district averages; *this is the fallacy that has suborned neglect of the non-taught by escalating achievements of the easily-taught.* Yet, some recent forays into the realm of accountability by state legislatures, state education agencies, and federal government agencies have earmarks of such simplistic miscarriages of strategy. "Accountability data" released by auditors, for example, seem to show that central city districts are doing "fifty percent worse" than a contiguous suburban district. Inside cities, so-called "achievement profiles" for individual schools publicly compare schools as if achievement is all on the same scale of difficulty. Naturally, big city governors look askance at such goings-on; this sort of "hogwash" smacks of the old pedagogy-by-punishment strategy and is surely counterproductive in the basic strategy of accountability. On the other hand, invention and application of criteria for accountability that will fit the mix in big cities, and at the same time not perpetuate past failures to *get* requisite achievement, are great urgencies if accountability is to perform its

mission. Fortunately, some very promising initial steps in these directions are evident. Extending and hastening those steps is a golden opportunity for the federalistic concert advocated earlier.

Performance contracting by big city districts has been one limited means for testing the strategy of accountability. Although the head of the Office of Economic Opportunity in January 1972 announced he was disenamored with "the success" of experiments in contracting with private enterprise for guaranteed student performance, many of those monitoring such experiments offer differing judgements and intentions to continue. Performance contracting with in-district groups is also very much alive. To pass judgement upon experiments as complex as performance contracting, conducted for three years or less and largely on jerry-built parsimonious frames, requires Olympian confidence. Perhaps experimentation should continue. While most state governments have demonstrated ingenuity and flexibility in finding ways performance contracting can be tried out within existing statutes, a fair trial will require considerable modification of existing legal frameworks for fullblown testing. Modifications for everybody are not recommended yet, however; "on approval" waivers can serve try-out needs. The point is that when a competent examiner of performance contracting in five typical centers reports, "Performance contracting facilitates the introduction of radical change in education [and] places increased emphasis on accountability for student learning [and] has spotlighted the inadequacy of gain scores on standardized achievement tests as measures of the effectiveness of instructional programs,"[1]* governments might be wise to really test the power of this tool under advantageous conditions.

Burgeoning Necessities Amidst Dwindling Resources

Some necessities confronting big city school districts have been documented already. From the whole city's standpoint, the greatest existent necessity is overcoming the unemployment and underemployment of its citizens, especially its young ones. The chief barrier between good jobs and what large portions of the city's citizenry do for a living is a gap in educational qualifications. A great light is dawning upon all the masters of big city schooling—career education to a degree and extent scarcely thought of before is an imperative for big city schools. And, the people to be educated for employability are not those who are compatible with the educational requirements—often blatantly irrelevant—for the good jobs available. Providing education for employability that makes sense to those who need it, and at the same time is saleable to an employer community so long devoted to using education's rituals to screen out city residents and attract in suburban dwellers, is a formidable necessity.

Other burgeoning necessities peculiar for big city schools deserve note. The epidemic proportions of violent crime against persons and property confronts school systems with unusual, and costly, necessity for protecting school pupils, personnel, and property against criminal

*Footnote references and selected references are given at end of the chapter.

acts. Tensions produced by massive desegregation require unprecedented provisions to prevent and/or control riots. Even more imperative is the necessity to overcome the cause-effect linkage between in-school experiences of some students and their recruitment to the fast-growing vocation of felonious criminality, a necessity that can be met only by difficult transformations in school programs and facilities. Mention of school facilities indexes another acute necessity of mammoth proportions for big city school districts. Where the need is greatest for a new day in schooling to be proclaimed and implemented, the inner cities offer old, miserable school plants, depressing atmospheres, constricted programs, and overcrowded institutions. Simply to bring school facilities abreast of the average in middle class suburbs will require, in most big city school districts, hundreds of millions of dollars. And that is only the beginning. Bringing "the schools" to a level of attractiveness, effectiveness and security that will reassure parents and students—certainly an absolute imperative—cries out for even larger resources. Then, big city school systems face what Lyle Fitch calls "a dinosaurian appetite which devours everything in sight and roars for more." A significant share of the roaring is for bigger salaries for public employees. The salary rates for big city school employees, in the organized competition for higher and higher "living wages," continue to escalate at a pace far outstripping statewide norms. The same is true for almost every service and commodity the school district purchases from others. Apparently, there is little that city school district governors can do except capitulate to the dinosaurian culture; the politics, pressures, and economics of that culture seem to make it absolutely necessary to pay premium prices for standard outputs. In short, burgeoning necessities, such as the four we have singled out, peculiarly characterize the context for schooling in big cities.

Dwindling resources also characterize that context. Contrary to popular belief, however, absolute fiscal resources at the behest of cities are not plummeting. For example, the taxable property per school child in the majority of big cities is larger than it was ten years ago, and often exceeds the statewide average. *It is the ratio between resources and inescapable demands upon those resources that is dwindling,* and drastically so. Property subject to local taxation is increasingly dwarfed by escalating requirements for tax support. Migration of industry to satellite locations retards the growth rates in the tax digest. Fiscal support from federal and state levels, quite significant in absolute figures, becomes insignificant when compared to the costs of regular operations, and frequently requires matching that further diminishes the local funds available for nonglamorous but vital endeavors. The resources "diminishing" most, however, are the human and societal ones. In this case, some absolute erosion has occurred as leaderly figures, education-dedicated people, and middle-class ethical and social norms have suburbanized. The dominant reasons given by suburbanites for leaving the city are schools and security, a striking index to what the city has lost in human power. Erosion is likewise obvious in the structures of governance and the channels for marshalling political self-help. The resource of popular

support for the local school system is definitely on the wane in big city locales as divisiveness, conflict and mistrust move in upon formerly existent confidence. The lesson to be drawn from these illustrations is not, however, that the humankind resources of big cities are in fatal decline. Instead, it is that *lost or eroded or obsolescent assets can be replaced by new, often different, ones.*

All three levels of government can attack the mismatch between necessities and resources. Some necessities, such as that of ministering to mammoth concentrations of children of poverty, can be reduced by governmental actions. Fiscal resources can be turned up by equitable school finance systems. Rebuilding of humankind resources can be addressed more deliberately, pointedly, and persistently. For example, concerted action by the three levels of government can certainly make neighborhood councils and their work a spawning bed for a new generation of community leaders if long-term dedication and tolerance–coupled with modest financial support–are given. To zero in on schools with another example, the field of "community relations" can be lifted from its insignificant role in annual budgets, program planning, and weightings in the need formula used in foundation program allotments and grants-in-aid. Resources never match necessities, in big city or any school district perhaps, but the degree of mismatch is amenable to what governments can do if they plan ahead and start right away.

Effective Governance and Obsolete Structures

Everything descriptive of big city school systems, present and future, utters a call for governance of those systems that is above the norm for effectiveness in the American educational establishment. The "normal" school system can survive with governance relatively impervious to differentials in the communities it serves. The city school system cannot; it must be effective in providing viable entries of community controls upon fundamental matters of school policy. The sheer range of differential manifestations of schooling demanded in cities calls for effectiveness in defeating the cult of uniformity, a cult it is still possible to subscribe to in more homogenous districts. In big cities, the governors must be minimally rule-bound, maximally creative and adaptable; in many other districts, following prescriptive state regulations and historic local precedents can produce a modicum of effectiveness. The right to transcend line-items and categorical restraints, so essential to getting priority jobs done in central city districts, requires degrees of expertise, trustworthiness and professionalism on the parts of governance personnel awfully hard to come by.

In big cities, governance for schooling has to be intertwined with governance for everything else to be even modestly effective in surmounting the big problems, and action in concert is always much more difficult than action in solo–as is demonstrated repeatedly when school desegregation and location of public housing proceed simultaneously. Then, in the current situation at least, effectiveness of governance in big city school systems is measured by the alacrity with which responsiveness occurs. In

less exacerbated cultures the traditional "wait and wait and wait" while governors study and process remediation may be tolerated; in big cities, tolerance is awfully thin. And as has been brought out repeatedly, governance for big city school systems must cope with a plethora of organized pressures and forces that add tremendous new dimensions to being effective at all. These and other illustrations tell why the pursuit of new-model effectiveness is a major preoccupation for all governors—local, state, and national—of big city schools.

Pitted against such pursuit are obsolete bequests from the past. School district boundaries are often more destructive than constructive in their locations and/or their impenetrability. Comprehensive planning for such vital program features as employability education is blocked by jurisdictional complexity. Organizational structures for school system management are tall and rigid bureaucracies that seem to thwart the most sincere efforts to diffuse decision-making. Plebiscites are required to levy local taxes for schools. Those who profit from centralized control of schools are strongly entrenched and can wield powerful sanctions against community control, calling state statutes or union contracts to their aid. The local politico-economic power structures all too often use their muscle to exploit the school system for jobs and contracts, and all too seldom support efforts to make pupil achievements the measure of effectiveness in governance. State government constraints upon program flexibility, anti-incentives to creativity, and upon the installation of managerial technology are prevalent. One drastic deterrent to effective governance of schools, however, is not old but new. The entrance of Federal District Courts into school administration and into monitoring of local school district governance—in some instances decreeing the establishment of quasi-governing boards paralleling legal authorities—has befuddled the distribution of power and siphoned off organizational energies into playing guessing games with unpredictable personalities. The last thing big city school systems need at this crucial juncture is another set of hit-and-run governors to further dishevel authority flows.

The moral here is clear. Governments can set the governance house in better order. Beyond that, they can take developmental actions to influence chartered governors toward increased effectiveness. In finality, however, it is the primary governors—namely, the boards and staff of big city districts—who must accomplish the renewals of philosophy and actions necessary to aggrandize the opportunities presented by enlightened governance.

Concentration and Coordination Amidst Separated Endeavors

The organized endeavors aimed at renewal of the typical big city number in the hundreds. Conceived and operated by multiple separate agencies, in aggregate they seem to have the muscle to make a significant difference. Too seldom, however, do they aggregate. This is particularly true of categorical, capital-letter Programs promoted by federal government and some state government agencies. "Model Cities" has its own guidelines, delivery system, required machinery, performance require-

ments. So does Title I of ESEA, Manpower Development, and so on and on and on. The kaleidoscopic shifts in signals, criteria, and funding for these governmental programs is a major deterrent to goal accomplishment, but that is not the present focus. It is their separatedness, their *apartheid* ethos, which causes major wastage of opportunity to make some lasting differences in the quality of city life and, particularly, the quality of education. The problem is that of causing Programs and their local ministerial agents to reinforce each other, pile resources on top of each other, move in the same directions, stop undoing each other's advances and hopes, and break through obliviousness to opportunities open to canny adapters.

The problem is being surmounted in enough isolated instances to demonstrate that viable concert is possible. For just one illustration, one social worker as a spark plug has brought into concentration in one eight-block big city area the extra services of seventeen separate programs. Children from birth to twelve years of age are the beneficiaries—although only two of the coopted programs are "educational" in administration. Measured results in two years are strikingly better for each Program's objectives than analagous results where the same programs are *apartheid*. This is concert. Producing it was painfully troublesome, but rewarding. Granting that none of the collaborators represented the really tough "go it alone" agencies, perhaps coordination is not as impossible as it seems.

No level of government for big city schools can to date be awarded medals for yeoman efforts on behalf of coordination. Some local governors have made meritorious forays, to be sure, but aggressive quest for collaborative parts and power in planning, and in enterprises, conducted by others is atypical. This is a pity because only local initiative and creativity can really produce concert—regardless of the utmost state and federal governments can do to set the stage. Senatorial courtesy—"we will sign off on your project if you will sign off on ours"—can and should be succeeded by active efforts to achieve common cause.

A great hope for reducing *apartheid* revolves at present around coalitioning of state and federal governments under the banner of comprehensive planning and its progeny. The office of the Governor in most states is growing apace in power to enforce interagency planmaking and concerted program execution. The state government looms larger and larger in the delivery systems of federal programs. Paralleling these, in many states, is the growth of executive branch and state education agency authoritativeness for special programs aimed at human opportunities. Thus we have machinery capable of reducing *apartheid* at its points of origin, of collating puny aids into significant assistance. The possibility now exists for state education agencies to exploit program opportunities for city schools even when not seized by local agencies. The Model Cities Project reported by the Department of Education in New Jersey is an exciting example.[2] The distance is still great between state capitol agencies and their Program managers at firing-line levels; signals to collaborate with other managers have difficulty in getting through. However, the networking of capitol agencies through gubernatorial offices of planning

and/or community affairs is making it much easier in many states to use top management intervention to solve local-level standoffs such as frequently occur, for example, between Community Action Programs and school system projects. Regional all-agency comprehensive planning under state sponsorship—using "Councils of Government," for example —seems to have considerable promise for imposing some order upon chaos, but reports on its success are checkered, and in many states the governors of school districts and/or state education agencies seem loath to concede any of their planmaking autonomy to such combines. Nevertheless, the trend toward federal government-state government coalition to make the state a prime arbiter of coordination and concentration in the design and execution of categorical programs is rich with opportunity. It can be used to reduce the negative effects of separatism upon product-enhancement for big city schools.

The Power to Propel

There is little doubt that Americans will move out to resolve these and similar dilemmas confronting schools in big cities—resolve them in favor of the opportunity side. Potency and immediacy in moving out is the concern of this publication. Some of the desired potency arises from knowing what to do and from finding out more about what will work. Succeeding chapters attempt to contribute to the knowledge component of potency. They also present insights and recommendations that their authors have arrived at.

Knowledge and insights, however, require propulsion to make impact upon the status quo. We have tried to indicate in preceding sections that propulsion should come from simultaneous inputs by many components of American society, especially from citizens banded together voluntarily to plan and produce change. Direct, supportive interchange between clients and an individual school is still the surest way known to enhance the quality of education. Citizen resolves, however, must often find their expression through the political channels our society provides. Therefore, pointed stress has been placed upon the roles of governments in aggrandizing the opportunities confronting big city schools. This is because governments have received, and will continue to receive, mandates and power. Here, power means muscle, ability, and access to strategies that can turn insights into active expressions. Such power can arise from legal empowerments, but its chief origin is from leaderly prestige, persuasiveness, and competence in cooperative planning on the parts of governmental agencies. Local, state, and federal governments acting singly, but primarily in federation, are capable of propelling decidedly constructive renewals in effectiveness for big city schools. We take the position they should do so, post haste.

At the present time, it appears that state governments have critical roles in causing increased propulsion to occur. They alone, in many instances, are authorized to make changes in the frameworks on which schooling within state borders is erected—and thus reduce the negative or

enhance the positive components of dilemmas confronting big city education. They are in strategic position to reinvigorate federalism in attacks upon the big city problems. They do have power. That is, in varying degrees they have, or can acquire, leaderly prestige, persuasiveness and competence in cooperative planning. Without exception, they have empowerments that can be used sagaciously to improve education for their urban constituents. Succeeding chapters direct attention to many changes that need to be wrought in central city schooling. The present chapter concludes, therefore, by pointing to the power resident in state governments to help produce those changes.

State government decides to have a state education agency and also decides what its state agency is up to. That is, what the agency has the authorization, capacity, and competence to tackle. These "up to" decisions are serial—usually made in conjunction with legislative appropriations, though occasionally by statutory enactments. The governors of the agency also make decisions and deploy activities expressing what the agency shall amount to. In some states, choices have added up to inconsequential roles and capacities for the state education agency. In the light of existing conditions in those states, this may seem appropriate but it certainly requires parallel delivery of extra resources, ministerial leeway, and leadership incentives to central city districts. In other states, empowerments delivered to governors of state education agencies are considerable. They can regulate, they can be developmental, they can earn authority. Ceilings on capacities may be low, but they are moveable over time. In such states, a careful re-examination of what state education agencies are doing to and for central city school clients may be richly rewarding. Agencies do things with regulations—regarding textbooks and their distribution, teacher certification, and fiscal accounting, for examples—that can open or close doors to innovation. They can use the leeway they have with Title I ESEA allocations and results-monitoring, or can supinely follow a path of least resistance. Agencies do things with technical assistance, technological support batteries, consultant services, concentrated projects for program development—but major consideration for big city needs in current endeavors is rare. Agencies do things with staff, and staffs act in terms of what they know most about—which, sadly, is not the real life in big city schools. Some state agencies are potent in focusing public attention, legislative response, and educationists' actions upon reform of school situations; others can become more potent. And, as has been indicated, state education agencies willing to work in close and persuasive collaboration with the Governor's Office and other executive branch agencies are making decided headway toward making more comprehensive, coordinated sense out of categorical programs. Recital of similar specifics could continue at great length, but perhaps the point is now clear. The doings of state education agencies—even as they are presently chartered and supported—can be examined with great profit as planners seek ways to deal with what is presented in this volume.

State constitutions and legislative statutes create the basic systems for financing schools. True, the federal government has got to reduce its

maverick proclivities and get in the round-up too. But essentially, how much money there is for schooling, where it comes from, and where it winds up to produce what school accomplishments, are obligations of state government. A subsequent chapter examines in some detail how these obligations are and can be discharged with equity for those citizens residing in big city districts. Obviously, great—and for some states, near-revolutionary—changes in the pattern of money flow are called for, and soon. Tendency for state government to respond slowly to such imperatives is understandable; government is no anthropomorphic creature that can decree miracles. That tendency is likely to prevail unless the friends of quality education recall that *what state governments have created they can likewise change*. The emphasis is upon *can*. Repeatedly, existing state school finance systems have been sharply modified, even drastically reconstituted, as the result of combining planning and political processes. This is what it takes to put state government muscle at the opportunity end of big city dilemmas. To view school finance as only dollars, however, may be shortsighted. The finance system can be a strategic weapon also. There are ways to pinpoint funds delivery in such fashion that particular goals in student achievement or program characteristics are likely to be advanced. State governments have been employing such strategy for years; the federal government is strongly wedded to it. Its efficacy is warmly debated. It is still wise, however, for any state to consider carefully what else can be wrought by stipulations or incentives that accompany the flow of dollars. Moving toward greater accountability for results accomplished with foundation support dollars is one live possibility, for example. The nature of the finance system is closely intertwined with the nature of the instructional system, the management support system and, particularly, the viability of the evaluation/accountability system.

State government also establishes, and modifies constantly, the statutory frameworks for delivering school services, the range and variety of services, the length of school years, and scores of similar matters are usually treated by statutes. When examination reveals that statutes are in some respects counter-productive for big city schooling, they can be modified. Some pressing necessities for big-city delivery of adequate varieties of education can be met by new authorizations. The same holds true, as has been indicated, for the ministerial regulations emanating from state education agencies. In the vast majority of instances, it is being discovered that such meliorations do not do harm to the frameworks for less-complex districts, by the way. The most fateful statutory prerogative of state government, however, is that of setting up a structure of districts to execute schooling. The boundaries of school districts are amenable to legislative modifications. Districts for collecting localized taxes and applying them to school needs do not have to be coterminous with school-operating districts unless legislatures so decide. Boundaries of school-operating districts can be made permeable to state citizens residing in contiguous districts if state legislation so directs. The state can establish districts with no pupils and no unionized employees, to receive and use large funds for technological beefing-up of school practice—thus circumventing some of the tendency to choke the state's pipelines to excellence with pay scales.

The state, with its districting structure, can certainly prevent, or at least damper, two prospects very much on the scene now—that New Towns are guises for new havens for escape from Blacks and Browns, and that strong little cities will be, by 1980, deprived central city reservations. Then, the empowerments that establish governors for big city schooling are delegations by state government. If a federation of largely self-determining units is a promising style of local district governance for the future, state government can afford the chance for a non-beleaguered piloting of this style and adopt it if it proves workable. The power to district is a power with great leverage.

We close by reiterating a premise stated earlier. Enhancing the opportunity ends of the dilemmas confronting big city schools is a job for many minds and many hands, working in many—but increasingly concerted—ways. Central to the job is planmaking and plan execution. If state government can put its muscle back of causing planmaking to occur and its strategic resources into executing plans made, it will have done a mighty bit.

Footnote References

[1]The Rand Corporation, *Case Studies in Educational Performance Contracting: Conclusions and Implications.* Prepared for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1971), pp. 38-39.

[2]New Jersey State Department of Education, *The Model Cities Project* (Denver: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1971).

Selected References

Banfield, Edward C., *The Unheavenly City.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co., Inc., 1970.

Bendiner, Robert, *The Politics of Schools.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1969.

Bollens, John C., and Henry J. Schmandt, *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics and Economic Life.* 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Campbell, Alan K., ed., *The States and the Urban Crisis.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Coons, John E., William H. Clune, and Stephen D. Sugarman, *Private Wealth and Public Education.* Boston: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Cunningham, Luvern L., *Governing Schools: New Approaches to Old Issues.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1970.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Task Force on Urban Education, *Urban School Crisis.* Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970.

Elazar, Daniel J., *American Federalism: A View from the States.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.

Fantini, Mario, *Reform of Urban Schools.* Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1970.

Hadden, Jeffry K., Louis H. Masatti, and Calvin J. Larson, eds., *Metropolis in Crisis.* 2nd ed. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1971.

Levin, Henry M., *Community Control of Schools.* Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1970.

Levin, Melvin, and Alan Shanks, eds., *Education Investment in Urban Society.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Lineberry, Robert L., and Ira Sharkansky, *Urban Politics and Public Policy*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1971.

McMurrin, Sterling M., *Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance*. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1971.

Netzer, Richard, *Economics and Urban Problems*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.

Rogers, David, *The Management of Big Cities*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1971.

Chapter 2

Urban Learning Environments, Opportunties, and Procedures*

Personnel in state education agencies and urban (big city) school systems who have the major responsibility for redesigning curricula and improving instruction are vitally concerned about the seemingly endless and practically insurmountable problems facing the schools in the urban environment. The need for cooperative leadership from state agencies and urban systems is clearly evident as these separate but related entities face mounting concerns. Yet, none of the critics and few of the scholars concerned about these matters seem to agree on what appear to be the most important problems, or on the priorities that must be established for meeting them. Serious questioning must replace the wringing of hands if any headway is to be made. Creative solutions are called for, and a *modus operandi* must be set up for working out the planned solutions. An understanding of the curriculum and instructional problems in our cities is essential. From this understanding determinations can be made as to what machinery should be used to bring about appropriate solutions to the problems.

That urban education is in deep trouble is a proposition to which both educators and laymen can subscribe. Educators see the crisis mirrored in rising dropout rates, low achievement test scores, illegal drug use, increased violence, and the growing exodus of good teachers and principals from schools where their skills are most needed. The public sees a crisis mirrored in a different perhaps distorted way, primarily due to its interpretation through the media. The *Blackboard Jungle* image of a generation ago has persisted, and the educational bureaucracy's inept attempts to cope with earlier identified problems have been dramatically reflected in such books as *Up the Down Staircase* and in a host of other more serious recent publications by disenchanted and conscientious people. Meanwhile, the news media inform the public about cities where schools have been closed for lack of funds; of muggings and vandalism; of drug abuse; of tense racial situations where court imposed desegregation has yet to find its final resolution; and of a host of other disturbing

*Prepared by *Joseph W. Crenshaw*, Chief, and *Rodney P. Smith*, Assistant Chief, Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Florida Department of Education, with the assistance of *Leonard Britton*, Associate Superintendent of Instruction, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida.

signs in the schools of the big cities—all of which point to the problems of urban society in general.

In the midst of these crises, the question naturally arises as to whether or not state education agencies are providing the leadership necessary to assist the schools during these trying times and to help point the way to a better future—a future characterized by less emotional reaction and more positive well-planned projection.

Some state education agencies are seeking new and dramatic ways to meet this challenge. The current concerns serve to underscore an underlying premise that if the state education agencies and the big city school districts are to develop and maintain adequate programs and procedures for improving the curriculum and instruction, they must become seriously involved in systematic long-range planning. No longer can these agencies afford the luxury of dealing merely with crisis situations and encouraging expedient decisions or delaying actions.

We are reminded by Doxiadis[1]* that, in order to escape the hodgepodge, helter-skelter thinking the urban environment tends to foster, man must think outside of his own lifetime. Doxiadis believed that man should constantly stay as much as 300 years ahead in his planning. To project several generations into the future brings a person almost inevitably to the conclusion that he must think in terms of children and education. Planning of this kind is never finished, and each successive step points to the need for further planning.

What Planning Tells Us

The greatest concentration of educationally deprived children appears to be found in the large urban centers. At the same time, some people are beginning to react overtly to the prevailing tendency to associate urban education with the educationally deprived—almost to the exclusion of all other educational clients. Certainly, the educationally deprived represent a most important priority. However, while this is a major consideration, more and more questions are being asked about the impact of urbanism on the average and gifted students who also happen to live in the urban area. Thus, another neglected area, a new group of deprived students, presents itself. Consequently, the problems and the challenges facing the big cities in education become more numerous and more complex.

Planning appears to be the logical route to follow—hopefully, a source of some light at the end of the tunnel. As an illustration of one planning effort, the approach taken by the Florida Department of Education in developing an exemplary educational research and development program should be considered. In a recent report,[2] the Florida Board of Governors for Educational Research and Development indicated that a key element of any organized educational program is inherent in the

*Footnote references are given at end of the chapter.

effective use of educational resource allocation patterns. The report states that, "The productive use of [educational resources] by classroom teachers . . . principals . . . superintendents . . . constitutes the essence of educational management."

This document endorses an analysis of the use of educational resources, describing it as "an analysis of the educational processes which are taking place." Recognizing that, at present there is no model for the analysis of the educational process that incorporates an analysis of educational resource utilization, the report recommends a search for a model that would evaluate the present use of educational resources and improve present effectiveness in instruction.

Included in the report is a definition of improved effectiveness of educational resources use that focuses on the following alternatives:

- Reduced cost without loss in pupil gains;
- Increased pupil gains with no increase in cost; and
- Increased pupil gains with corresponding increase in cost, but where the increased cost is considered justified (by educational decision makers).

This program, to all appearances, has effectively set broad goals and precise objectives to an action program—one that is forward-looking and should lead to long-range improvements. Such an approach does not ignore the emotional issues of the moment, but declares that such issues are less important in terms of priorities. This kind of long-range planning holds the promise of bringing about the changes that are needed in urban education.

Procedures for Identifying and Selecting Promising Alternative Practices

Procedures must be designed for identifying, selecting, and implementing promising alternative practices. State education agencies and their urban partners, in all probability, will not advance very far in planning unless the partners have a viable method for seeking and testing alternative practices, and have settled on a procedure for facilitating the development and implementation of the method.

Identification of Procedures

Alternative programs and practices may be identified through a systematic search of the relevant literature and a review of empirical research such as is found in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).

At nationwide conferences and seminars related to urban education, challenging presentations and meaningful discussions of alternative programs are normally part of the agenda. Frequently, the subject matter is discussed a year or more before these practices find their way into the

state-of-the-art literature. Most of the state education agencies and a large number of urban school systems have individuals and teams who attend and participate in the various professional conferences for this reason.

Another method of becoming acquainted with alternative practices is through a systematic needs assessment that utilizes creative brainstorming as part of the process—a method frequently employed with success in industry.

Selection of Procedures

From a myriad of alternative programs, how do state education agencies and urban school systems select appropriate programs for use in certain situations? One vital approach is to set up a procedural pattern that calls for more involvement and interactions of both citizens and professional educators. A design such as the following represents one general approach that can help to establish the necessary linkages in moving from an interpretation of community need to necessary curriculum redesign:

- A philosophy for the urban school system must be developed. (Citizens through a citizens' advisory board, can be held largely responsible for the dialogue that leads to the development of this philosophy. However, there must be leadership by educational administrators and perhaps released time for teachers to work with this board.)
- Goals must be devised that fit within the framework of this philosophy. (The contributions of citizens are significant in this process, but leadership and staff assistance from professional educators skilled in group processes are also needed.)
- Objectives must be determined that are related to the attainment of these goals. (The contributions of citizens and students are important here. Specific help should be provided by the professional educators.)
- Task analyses are necessary in order to determine how best to meet these objectives. (Citizens are still involved, but the professional educator's comments emerge as more important because of his training and experience.)
- Systems are devised based on research theories as well as pragmatic considerations. These systems should optimize the use of buildings, people, curriculum designs, and instructional procedures. (In this consideration, the contributions of professional educators are of great importance. But it is also important that the lay citizen be brought along with the planning as well.)

State educational agencies must take broad leadership responsibilities not only in working with urban educators in order to establish and maintain workable guidelines, but also in actual involvement in the procedure.

The guidelines that are developed should emphasize the public's role in schools, but not suggest that the educator's professional responsibility be abrogated.

The Involvement of People in Urban Education

How may educators involve citizens in the school programs? Certainly, they should have the kind of in-depth involvement previously discussed and not just as elementary school "homeroom mothers" nor the more active PTA worker—though these are important and helpful entities.

Role of Citizens in Education

Deeper involvement is advocated and many alternatives are available. The objective is to involve people in a constructive manner in matters of concern to both the educator and the lay citizen.

The Idea of Neighborhood Schools. If the community views the school as a neighborhood school, much involvement can follow naturally. Decentralization could bring citizens more actively into the decision-making process.

Public and Private School Relationships. Interaction is needed between public schools on the one hand and the private schools and colleges on the other. Hundreds of thousands of students are educated in parochial and private schools. Not only do the students of public and private schools need to come together, but also their parents and teachers need to see some common goals of a pluralistic society as well.

Intercultural and Interracial Interaction. The different ethnic, cultural, and racial groups of the community need to share one another's view of life through such intensified experiences as television, radio, "cultural fairs," group discussion, and the like. Although integrated schools may represent the start of human understanding, the greater community is the true schoolroom of human concern and understanding.

Planning Among Civic and Intergovernmental Groups. It would be interesting to note just how much cooperative planning goes on within and without urban school systems. From school to school, how much planning is there? How much long-range planning is there between education systems and departments of transportation? Comprehensive and coordinated planning would involve schools and communications systems, housing and urban development and commercial interests such as heavy and light industry and shopping centers.

Voices of Students

Not only has the citizen's role in education in the United States become minimal, but also *the potential role of students has been largely overlooked.* There are some programs where the student voice is beginning to be heard. One such instance is the Philadelphia Parkway Program where high school students choose their own subjects to study, and

where the facilities of public institutions and businesses serve as classrooms. There are similar programs in Chicago (Metro High School) and in White Plains, New York (Edu-Cage) that provide alternative student-responsive schools. Such schools indicate trends away from the often-oppressive school styles of the past and base their approach on student motivation studies which indicate that *students learn best what they want to learn, and resist imposed programs.* Revelance pertains to the closing of the gap between academic learning and the real world—using current newspapers, magazines, television, and movies for content, for example.

Programs aimed toward meeting the student's needs through curriculum designs related to his motivation and imagination are clearly the way for future improvement in urban centers and elsewhere. Parents who worry about a student's self-discipline will find that it may come about by increasing the student's ability to learn independently. Responsiveness to student needs holds the promise of building responsibility and internal commitment in the student.

Student Governance

Governance among students is closely tied to student learning, but somehow nothing seems to cause more controversy throughout educational administrative circles than the suggestion that in fact students have considerable ability to govern themselves. Feelings run high on this issue in the adult society and among society's young, but *in the end it is the young who must prepare themselves for the future;* it is they who must live in tomorrow's world and not the elders. Perhaps this insight has stimulated the younger generation to a new sense of urgency—an urgency that cannot be met by mere tokenism such as student councils, but must be met by more substantive moves as evidenced in such instances as:

- Student representation on the board of education;
- Classes devised and taught by students;
- More student freedom with commensurate responsibility;
- Student courts with limited but nevertheless real authority; and
- Institution of the student ombudsman concept.

All of these ideas, if taken seriously, increase the potential of city and state alike to resolve conflicts, to maintain responsibility undergirded by statutory decree, and to subscribe to and encourage due process.

Role of Professional Educators

For many years the professional educator has been almost the sole voice and authority about education. The curriculum has sometimes been defined as "that which happens after the teacher closes the classroom door." Yet in the past few decades, the media have brought to the public a new curiosity and eyes that more and more wish to see through what has been referred to uncomplimentarily as the blackboard jungle. Urban schools must squarely face a redefinition of the role of the professional

educator—not only in the interworkings of the education profession itself, but in the outer workings of that profession with the rest of society. A few questions worth asking might include:

- Is teaching a profession?
- How do public school teachers obtain and retain professionalism?
- How do superintendents, boards of education, and teaching staff interrelate?
- Who is responsible for taking research to action programs in the schools?

Clearly these and similar questions need to be answered. For one thing, the maintenance of teaching as a profession, equal in prestige and respectability, as well as in expertise, to the law and medical professions, has yet to be established. It has been said that teaching has been founded mostly as an art and not as a science. But whose fault is it when, in this technological age, *much more is known about the science of learning than is actually put into practice?* Indeed, the research and advanced technology which should have impact suffers because of the lack of a delivery route in education. Shelly Umans refers to the educational enterprise as being a "non-system." Umans contends;

> . . . the educational system in this country is an amorphous 'abominable snowman.' It is ubiquitous, but nebulous. It defies definition. To refer to it as a 'system' is a misnomer. It is without structure and mission. It is unmanaged.

Thus, the education profession faces the question of management. Is education to be represented by labor (the teachers) and management (administrators and supervisors) with the board of education serving as the board of directors? Or is teaching truly to emerge over the next several decades as a profession similar in structure to a hospital model of nurses, aides, and orderlies, generalists and multitudes of specialists, as well as hospital administrator types who are business men first and not physicians at all? Such seems to some people to be the message of the differentiated staff concept as evidenced in such places as Temple City, California; Portland, Oregon; Miami, Florida; Kansas City, Missouri; New York City; and other urban centers. Such staffing patterns emphasize pre-service and in-service professional training, a long internship; a professionally-governed system still accountable to the public, but dedicated to the business sense of task analysis; and to an educational science embodied in such positions as research specialists and curriculum associates. Differentiated staffing may not have caused education to arrive as a profession, but it has served to point education in the direction of professionalism that has long been sought.

New Commitments for State Leadership

What then should be the educational commitments of leadership at the state and local levels? Very definitely there should be great interest in facilitating necessary legislation to accomplish the following in urban education:

- A reaffirmation of the citizen's role in education;
- An institution of student rights in school governance; and
- Laws designed to support teaching as a profession, either preceded by or followed by a restructuring of the teaching profession.

Such rudimentary concepts could go far toward developing a workable and manageable system of education with state support being given where support is most needed–the crowded urban centers where most of the students are.

Of importance here is the total process: a procedure for identifying and selecting promising practices. It has been emphasized that this procedure should involve both professional educators and lay citizens and that the voice of students should command attention. The alternative ideas presented herein are merely given as examples as to what can be done to help alleviate some of the problems in urban education.

The Emerging Learning Environments

During a period of rapid change such as our society is experiencing, planning in education is beset with trends that appear contradictory in their thrusts. For example, one can find trends on the one hand toward educational parks, enormous in their scope. On the other hand, there are trends toward a return to the small school or schools within schools where a sense of belonging may be established and where individualization and attention to small groups may occur. Thus, there are clusters of residential colleges based on the Oxford model located on some of our giant multiversity campuses. And with this dual approach toward new educational institutions, there has come an amazing technological revolution–a media explosion where television, computers, transistor radios, recorders and tapes, even neon signs, struggle with the schools for supremacy in the competition for attention. McLuhan has appropriately emphasized that "the medium is the message . . . and the massage" in this situation.

If the message of our walled schools and even our latter-day open space wall-less schools is rigid control of education through institutionalization, the message of the environment beyond the curriculum walls is quite another. Students learn more outside the school than in it. Many have acquired a new life style from the records of a once-obscure group called the Beatles. Youth tends to accept the habiliment and conversational overtones of mass produced paperback books or movies. War and press coverage of war in the Orient brings new attention among the young to yoga, I Ching, incense, and such contraptions as waterbeds.

The school of contemporary youth must, like the waterbed, become an amorphous space–a featherbed rather than a rigid jail-cell mattress. It should embody a learning style more akin to the fashioning of a spider's web, which grows outward in widening gyres and in all direc-

tions, than to an orderly and sequenced stair-step, grade-by-grade, subject-by-subject affair.

Learning itself must change. The rate of learning of early twentieth century vintage, that stood still long enough to get caught in print, is being replaced by microsecond frames of videotape, the instant replay of live action, and transworld communication by Telestar. Training for skills that still require drill can be accomplished by a small box-like videotape cartridge. Teaching and learning of the past in the hope that it will be applicable in an unknown future situation will be replaced by teaching and learning for creative endeavor—learning that emphasizes thought processes of flexibility, adaptation, fluency, and diverse thought. Within this framework rests the potential for a new and exciting education to meet the needs of the learner not only in the urban, but also in the non-urban setting.

Some forward looking state education agencies are experimenting with new patterns of schooling for all citizens of all ages. Ultimately choices will have to be made. These choices will not be the simple, binary choices of Robert Frost's pastoral scene in which "two roads diverged" to symbolize life's decisions. Rather, the number of paths of possible innovation in education in the coming decades can be infinite.

Even in view of the strategies demanded in educational planning, educators may be apt to take an apathetic view of the possibilities. Thinking that the future will be bright and wonderful automatically, they sometimes fail to realize that *without action now there may be no bright future*. Without appropriate action, education, like the old small town movie house (and modern day television), is destined to run and re-run old movies to the benefit and enlightenment of but a few persons. Research indicates that many things can be accomplished now. *Much more is known today than is being done*. It might be helpful to examine in this context some concrete practices that are already in operation—encouraged by leaders who do not leave the future to the future but accept their leadership responsibilities in the present.

Alternative Ideas to Traditional Schooling

A multitude of ideas are forming the bridge to the future and what education can be. The future, in part, is here in the new ideas that have moved beyond the "talk" stage to a point of implementation.

Independent Study

Many elementary school, middle school, and high school students across the nation are presently learning in a multitude of new ways ranging from independent study to large group instruction. Comparable to checking out a library book, some students can take home for individual use small cassette tape recorders and playback equipment, records, academic games, and other auto-instructional devices.

One of the promising new inventions is the electro-video tape recorded cartridge, known simply as VTR, with its own electro-videotape recorder and play-back equipment. This small videotape cartridge will run 30 to 100 minutes, and can be utilized through an attachment to a home television set. Japanese industrialists[4] believe that the video cassette will enter the educational market as a very important means of supplementary learning and that it holds great promise for adult education since cassettes can be used at any time, in any place. VTR has great promise in its potential for revolutionizing present-day education. Conceivably the following changes could materialize:

- Students could learn at home;
- The school itself could become an administrative distribution center;
- Classrooms could disappear; and
- Teachers could make "home calls" or students could make apponitments for diagnostic office calls.

Mini-Schools

In the late 1960's there was some attention given in educational planning to educational parks. It was envisioned that these parks would house many thousands of students in a large community-like environment for educational purposes and also furnish health and welfare services. At about the same time, the idea of the mini-school emerged. This opposing concept emphasized the intimacy and individuality of the small school. Various versions of a small school design are found in Miami, Philadelphia, Chicago, Hartford, and Providence. Some of these are "schools without walls" that use urban area resources for learning. Projects particularly stressing the intimacy of the small school can be found in St. Paul, Great Neck, New Rochelle, and New York City as well.

New York City's pilot mini-school, Harambee Prep, is an example of government, citizens, and industry working together under the joint sponsorship of New York City, the New York Urban Coalition, and McGraw Hill Industries, with working relationships emerging as a partnership. Schools such as Harambee are designed to relate to the student's mores and life styles in an intimate setting where a maximum amount of individualized help can be provided and small group activity in learning can prevail.

Computer-Based Management Information Systems

The Los Angeles Unified School District has announced plans to develop a computer-based management information system that may serve as a model for other large urban school districts. Called AIMS (Automated Instructional Materials Services), the system should be capable of providing administrators, teachers, and students with a central source of information about the entire array of learning materials stocked in the school district.

Hopefully this federally-supported project will be a prototype to

help educators who are finding it increasingly difficult to keep track of the bewildering variety of books, tapes, films, and other instructional aids that have inundated school systems in recent years. AIMS will attempt to consolidate information about both audio-visual products and print materials into one easily-accessible data bank and thus provide school personnel with a valuable tool for the more effective management and use of instructional resources. Once operational, the AIMS project should be able to:

- Support normal ordering and cataloging of learning materials.
- Provide administrators with relevant control data such as analyses of circulation figures.
- Serve as an automated system for locating and requesting films, tapes, and other audio-visuals for classroom use.
- Produce bibliographies, subject lists, and other fundamental tools for use by teachers and students.

It should be underscored that the few examples that have been presented are merely illustrative of ideas being put into practice to meet urban needs in education. What works one place will probably need to be adapted when implemented elsewhere. However, nothing can be accomplished unless there is a strong interest and a desire to improve urban education.

What the educational "system" in the United States appears to need is *a new delivery system.* The role of state education agencies should point in this direction. The challenges are great and time and resources are limited. The logical question in reference to the situation is: What are the educational priorities that should be established by state education agencies and big city school systems?

The Formative Years and Lifetime Education

A society best serves itself by providing educational experiences for all its members who can profit from learning. Education in this light is not viewed so much as an expenditure but as an investment. Of all of our citizens, no groups stand so deeply in educational need as do the very young and the older citizens—the former because so much can be done in their formative years, and the latter because so many changes have occurred so rapidly, they need help to avoid becoming social and psychological outcasts unable to lead a self-satisfying or socially rewarding life.

The expense of education continues apace and yet, our society has not met the needs of our young and the older children and young adults—all of whom are beset with needs that could be met through the availability of an expanded educational opportunity. Not that America has failed in education; far from it. *By world standards the American education system is a paragon,* but held up to the "meter stick" of our society's aspirations there is much yet to do in terms of what should be done.

Measured in this manner, *our system is somewhat pedestrian as evidenced by its adherence to outmoded traditions.* The graded 1-12 program, especially in the urban centers where well over half of the students drop out somewhere along the way and are abandoned with no salable skills, is but one example. Other examples are the community college, which was thought to be a means of fulfillment of the dream of universal higher education, and the universities which remain as institutions largely inherited from the middle ages and fulfilling a function from that time. All of these, as they have been structured, appear to be dysfunctional in terms of the need.

False Concepts in American Education

Underlying an early pseudocommitment to education in the United States is the merit badge approach to learning. If there is amusement when kindergarten classes "graduate" with mock caps and gowns, there should be despair about how students pass, lockstep, from grade to grade. Why must there be twelve years of schooling followed by graduation? Why four years of college capped by a baccalaureate degree? Why not continuing education, as Margaret Mead has suggested, where students drop in and out of formal education periodically and approach learning and life as a gestalt? To be sure, many present attempts at education still follow the symbolic ringing of the ancient schoolmaster's bell. Our five-days-a-week, limited-periods day, nine-months-a-year schedule still largely follows the old agrarian model—a model that leaves a major portion of our citizenry outside the schoolhouse.

Areas of Possible Educational Reform

In considering possibilities for effecting reforms in certain aspects of the American educational system, some educators have begun to look at the Kubbutz schools of Israel, the British Infant schools and the early childhood programs of the Soviet Union as viable models that express concern for the most important formative years in a person's development. The structure of the school day and the curriculum is becoming a matter of open options and open plans based on careful diagnosis in such programs as independent study, peer tutoring, and personalized instruction that are found to some slight degree and in some form in the schools of many of our major cities. Here again, what is known in whole is done only in part.

Older patterns of institutionalized schooling, such as the 8-4 plan and the 6-3-3 plan, have led the society to place too much faith in the "junior high school." It emerged, unfortunately, as a watered down version of the senior high school that was itself patterned primarily as a college-prep school. Fortunately, explorations led by Jerome Bruner at Harvard, John Goodlad at U.C.L.A., and William Alexander at the University of Florida have led us to a consideration of non-graded classes, non-sequential curricula, and a reconsideration of the unique needs of the emerging adolescent. Such a movement cannot help being better than the older junior high school that had most of the faults of the American high school and few of its merits.

Thus a new form of American education gradually begins to take shape. What the latter nineteenth century and the first two thirds of the twentieth century had seen as a trend to compartmentalize education has become, in the latter third of the twentieth century, a serious matter of concern as to its value in meeting needs. *It appears very apparent that education be individualized, but groupings must also be individualized.*

Since children learn much in their formative years, as verified through research, society must establish appropriate challenges and provisions for them to learn. Early childhood education, even nursery schools, become important to a society that really is concerned beyond the immediate future—outside a particular lifetime. Likewise, later childhood must not be regarded as just a period of "little men and little women" (miniature adults), but as a middle period of growth where special kinds of learning take place.

There is a growing realization and acceptance of the fact that adolescence creats special problems that require imaginative answers. Where once society imposed a *high school,* a school which was college preparatory in nature, a new school or several new types of school are demanded. It is envisioned that a merging of the old high school and the newer community college will also provide the sequence needed for continued learning in young and more mature adult lives.

Whether the traditional university becomes the multiversity pervading the whole society with not just a terminal degree but a perpetually renewable diploma remains to be seen. Such plans are underway in New York State and may be the harbinger of the university model for the future.

In all of this, there is the need for state education agency leadership and urban participation. *The cities hold the promise of being either models of blight or blessing in the world of tomorrow.* The city—the urban center—is not something that will simply go away or solve itself. The super city—the megalopolis—even now is forming in several regions. If the enigmas of the older metropolis cannot be solved, how can progress be achieved for a future that will be even more complex?

Constraints and Constraint Removal

Any attempt to improve or revitalize the educational system of the big city will quickly bring to light many and varied constraints—some of which may not have been previously apparent. These constraints include those imposed by traditions, personalities, policies, and statutes. A major focus of any effort to improve big city school systems must be directed toward contraint removal.

Of the various constraints, those imposed by law or policy seem to be easiest to overcome because the statute or policy is written and can be changed. An excellent treatise concerning constraint removal has been developed by Jacob G. Beard and Garret R. Foster.[5] Their constraint

removal system together with a "Constraint Removal Matrix" (Figure 1) is included in this section. Its applicability to state education agencies and large urban sysems is unmistakable.

Constraints Imposed by State Law and Policy

Constraints that are imposed by state law or by state board policy are the ones most easily handled. An examination of school laws and state board regulations will verify the reality of this type of constraint, and may provide removal strategies for those that are real. To assist the user in this process, a guide has been developed to facilitate the surveying of state statutes relating to specific felt constraints. The guide advises which specific school laws and which state board regulations one would refer to in order to deal with constraints in the areas of: (1) personnel; (2) space; (3) time; (4) curriculum; (5) finance; and (6) media.

In addition, the system identifies the location of general powers and specific responsibilities of people and policy making boards who have authority to remove constraints that are shown to be unnecessary or unreasonable.

Constraint Removal

Situational, personality, or tradition influenced constraints pose a different problem for a system of constraint removal. At this level, one runs into greater difficulty sorting fact from opinion and policy from personality. A system for removing peculiar local constraints must therefore be based on strategies relevant to a variety of different types of local issues and must be approached at a lower level of specificity. The constraint removal system that is presented has been developed on the basis of research being done in the areas of planned change and educational decision processes.

In the context of constraint removal, a person must deal with resource availability and resource use. A constraint is present either as a result of the dearth of needed resources or because of the manner in which they are being used. Attitudes may become constraint sources when they are the decisive factors in prohibiting necessary or desired changes that in turn effect the availability and use of resources.

The removal strategy at the local level involves the identification of: (1) *the source* of the constraint (the cause or reason a constraint is present), (2) *the location* of a constraint (the place, person, body, or structure which gives the constraint power), and (3) *the area affected* by the constraint (the structure, organization, or person affected by the constraint).

Figure 1 is an example of a removal strategy that incorporates the following five steps:

1. Identify the *area* of the action which is being constrained and classify it under one of the eight categories listed in the columns across the top of the table.

Figure 1. CONSTRAINT REMOVAL MATRIX

	MAJOR AREAS							
SOURCES	Planning and Resource Allocation	Human Talent Utilization	Technology Utilization	Curriculum Concerns	Space and Facilities	Time Utilization	Student Achievement and Accountability	Socio-psychological Factors
Competency	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,7,9	1,2,3,5,	1,2,3,9	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,9
Attitude	1,7,8,9,10	1,3,7,8, 9,10	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9
Policy	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8		6,8	6,8

POSSIBLE STRATEGIES (Number Code)*

1. Rebudget
2. Reallocate
3. Reorganize
4. Restructure
5. Provide Resources
6. Take Required Action
7. Recruit
8. Public Relations
9. Retrain
10. Reward

LOCATION	APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES
Staff	1,2,3,5,7,8,9,10
Constituted Board	6,8
Authority Hierarchy	6,8
Professional Organization	8
Student Body	1,2,3,5,7,8,9,10
Community	7,8,10

*The number code is applicable to the cells and to the location strategies.

2. Identify the *source* (reason for) of the constraint and classify it within one of the four categories along the horizontal dimension of the table.

3. Identify the *location* of the constraint and categorize it under one of the six headings listed A through F in the table.

4. Find the cell at the intersection of the "area" column and the "source" row. The numbers in the cell may then be matched with the strategy numbers corresponding to the "location" of the constraint. The matching numbers reflect appropriate alternative removal strategies for the type of constraint identified.

As an example, suppose one found an *absence of competency* (source) in *planning skills* (area) within a *staff* (location). The matrix lists five possible strategies for the planning/competency cell (2, 3, 5, 7, and 9). With these alternatives in hand, one can now move to select the appropriate strategy or combination of strategies for removing the constraint. In this case, the alternatives range through reallocating resources, reorganizing the staff, increasing resource input, recruiting new staff talent, or retraining the present staff. The system provides a detailed description of each of the constraint removal strategies listed.

5. The last step requires the (a) listing of alternative strategies, as revealed in the matrix, (b) the consideration of all consequences which may follow the employment of each strategy, (c) the assess-

ment of the feasibility of each set of strategies, (d) the decision as to whether to act or not, and (e) implementing the selected strategy.

The system of constraint removal developed by Beard and Foster is complete with step 5 except for the necessary additional steps of adaptation and institutionalization. The system must be modified to fit the needs of local school situations and, following sufficient trial and revision, should be institutionalized and become an ongoing function of a local district as it works toward achieving its instructional goals.

Strategies for Improving Education

Many people and some national groups have emphasized the fact that education in the big cities is in serious trouble. The President's Commission on School Finance has stated:

> The schools in the big cities are caught in two desperate crises—one financial, the other racial, and the two are becoming a single over-riding emergency as inadequate funds affect school and education quality . . . .[6]

The Commission also observed:

> The condition of the big city schools should clearly become a matter of immediate concert to the States . . . . Any hope of solution to the complex of urban problems must begin with the States' assigning high priorities to the urgent needs of their cities, most particularly to the needs of inner city schools.[7]

Short-sighted decisions relating to earlier policies, planning or strategies can be remedied if they are clearly recognized and appropriate steps are taken to avoid similar decisions and procedures in the future. In developing appropriate policies and procedures for improving learning environments and opportunities in the cities, it is especially important that the respective roles, responsibilities and relations of the states and cities, and also of the federal government, not only be clearly defined and agreed upon by the entities involved, but also that they be understood and accepted at least by leading representatives from the general public. It must also be recognized and clearly understood by everyone concerned that the emerging roles, necessitated by developments in a rapidly changing society, will differ in many ways from those that have been accepted in the past, or even are observed in many states at present.

It seems apparent that each state, along with its other important responsibilities, should provide the leadership and services needed to develop and get a "working" agreement on:

- Appropriate state-wide goals for education and feasible alternative procedures for attaining them;
- Valid procedures that may be utilized for appraising and reporting on problems and progress in attaining these goals;
- Viable alternatives to traditional educational programs and procedures;

- Defensible guidelines for improving learning environments, opportunities and procedures; and
- Effective ways of helping local school systems—and especially the core cities—to develop supplementary goals and strategies for attaining them.

Moreover, under modern conditions it is essential that each state proceed promptly to identify and seek to eliminate any laws, regulations or other constraints that make it difficult or impossible for local school systems—and especially city systems—to take the steps that seem to be necessary to improve their provisions for, or procedures in, education.

On the other hand the local school systems—and especially large city systems—need to develop and implement comprehensive long-range plans and strategies for improving their own programs and provisions for education, and for eliminating traditional policies and practices that are no longer defensible. To accomplish this purpose, they will need and should seek assistance from the state and other appropriate sources.

Some of the major concepts and strategies that should be helpful in accomplishing these purposes are discussed briefly under the headings that follow.

Managing the Educational System

Education in the big cities is a vast enterprise. In its administration, considerable attention must be devoted to large system management, and such management must subscribe to the tenet that education belongs to and is for the benefit of the people. It is through involving both lay citizens and students (education's clients) that the internal commitments so urgently needed can be generated. With the undergirding provided by broad citizen support, educators can move forward with planning that looks to the future, and education can facilitate its process of renewal through a stronger voice in the legislative halls. Thus education can begin to direct change within the system rather than react to it.

Of overall importance in improving the management of the educational system is the need to delineate clearly how centralized administration may best help and what administrative services may be decentralized. The promise of small group processes and of differentiated staffing should provide clues to state education agencies in this regard.

Such thinking will almost inevitably lead from professional leadership to citizen involvement and implementation as in the following example. In California when one new high school was being planned, the question was raised: *What kind of life ought to be lived in this new building?* To help find the answer, some creative people from various parts of the nation were invited to participate in a two-day conference to which the people in the community, including students, were also invited. What was the result? The Foster City High School has been designed to become a school "dedicated to stamping out boredom," an institution to be used by the entire community, and a school in which the community participated from the beginning in the planning of the facilities.

EXPERIMENTATION TO PROTOTYPE

Although the larger social system (the entire United States) is almost incomprehensible, educators can learn to understand the changing educational milieu in the urban setting. We have moved from farms to towns to cities, and seem to be headed toward a society based on "the megalopolis." Society can no longer afford schools that do not keep pace with changing societal needs. It is only through research, development, and broad experimentation directed toward a more functional delivery system that state and city education agencies will be able to make significant progress in providing necessary leadership.

Learning vs. Teaching. New ideas are needed in teaching for creative endeavor; the youngsters of today must be able not only to adapt, but to shape the world in which they will find themselves in maturity—the twenty-first century. Rote memorization will not equip them: creativity and inquiry in all its aspects must be emphasized. *Alternative modes of education in which learning—not teaching—is the focus must be identified and utilized.*

Involvement of Youth. Young people today may be more aware of the trends in technology than many people give them credit for. As educator-humanist Sidney Jourard of the University of Florida points out, they have traveled more, seen more (thanks to the media), and done more than children of earlier generations. Actually it appears that students are only pretending to be the kind of children whom conventionally trained teachers can teach.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TO CONTINUING EDUCATION

Early childhood education must gain massive support; at the same time continuing education must be encouraged and expanded. As metropolis gives way to megalopolis, so must university give way to multiversity. And the multiversity may not always be in one place. Currently, a Commission on Non-Traditional Study, funded by a Carnegie Corporation grant, is looking into external degree programs. A major purpose is to find out how good they are, and how they can be improved. After exploring all phases of post-secondary education, the Commission is considering the possibility of creating some experimental models.

Ideas such as the ones that have been presented are the kind that state leadership must generate and fit into a master plan for the improvement of education. From the past to the present is first generation thinking. Second generation thinking must move ahead more rapidly than is presently the case. Planning, incidentally, becomes more difficult in second generation thinking because the rate of change is faster.

Thus, *the present urban educational crises can be viewed as an opportunity for a new type of educational leadership at both state and local levels.*

This new leadership must ensure that emphasis is placed on enlightened and creative management—not management primarily for the pur-

pose of encouraging stability and efficacy. The new administrative scientists must place at the heart of the program an unfailing emphasis on:

- The learner;
- Basic skills development; and
- Ways to show to the community that education is sound, that education is fiscally responsible, that there is an adequate teaching staff and adequate special support services.

This new kind of educational leadership must also act as a regulator on what might be called instant innovation or runaway trends keeping in mind always what is best for the learner. The effect that open-plan schools, extended school year, flexible scheduling, and similar developments will have on the learner in a particular situation should be a foremost consideration. The new leadership must have available the management information necessary to take what in some instances will be a lonely and courageous stand in opposition to some untested proposals for change. This stance must be balanced by continuing to encourage creativity throughout the system.

It should be the goal of this new educational leadership at both state and local levels to encourage and direct needed changes in education rather than to be caught constantly in a defensive and expensive posture of reaction. On the immediate horizon this calls for direction in:

- More emphasis on the behavioristic approach to learning as opposed to the gestalt-perceptual approach—the former a program based on specific objectives, the latter a program which sees the teacher almost as a group therapist;
- Helping to resolve the troublesome social problems associated with civil rights and the schools—rather than focus on desegregation alone —but also on student rights, teachers rights, court decisions, all affecting the economics of the school and its curriculum; and
- The emerging ideas in staff development that are placing urban school districts more and more in teacher education through such increasingly accepted practices as performance-based teacher training and certification.

All of these components, along with a host of others, cry out for positive leadership. *At no time in the history of education has the demand for creative leadership and effective management been greater.*

This kind of leadership will *demand leaders who can blend the outlooks and attitudes of businessmen, of humanist visionaries, of scientists, and of poets.* These persons must work closely with the system, but not become a slave to an unchangeable mode of management. In the final analysis, these prospective leaders must change their individual courses

from careers that were fashioned by a twentieth century mold to a new design that must incorporate the demands of the remainder of this century as well as the twenty-first century.

Footnote References

[1]*Encyclopedia Britannica, 1970 Yearbook*, p. 2.

[2]*Report of the Research and Development Program for Fiscal Year 1971* (Tallahassee, Florida: State of Florida Department of Education, February 1972).

[3]Shelley Umans, *The Management of Education* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1970), p. ix.

[4]*I/D/E/A Reporter* (Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Winter 1971).

[5]Jacob G. Beard and Garret R. Foster, *Manual for the Resource Utilization Analysis Procedure*, Unpublished document (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, 1971).

[6]*Schools, People & Money* (Washington, D. C.: President's Commission on School Finance, March 1972), p. 43.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 44.

Chapter 3

Political and Organizational Dynamics In Urban-State Relations*

The relationships between city school districts and state education agencies or departments of education have seldom been cordial, extensive, or productive. The purpose of this chapter is to examine these two organizations, to note their characteristics, to determine why interaction has been difficult or ineffective, and make some projections about the future—that is, to suggest why and how such relationships should be improved.

If constraints affecting collaboration are to be understood, it should be apparent that city school districts and state education agencies need to be examined not only in terms of their own characteristics but also in a political context. This approach utilizes the notion that both city school districts and state education agencies are subsystems of a larger social system. Indeed, the political system itself is a subsystem of the larger social system and both city schools and state departments of education are parts of that system and are affected by it. To be quite specific, when state legislators are predominantly rural or suburban in outlook, most decisions they make will likely have some rural or suburban coloration; they are apt to find it difficult to give proper consideration to cities and their needs. Indeed, the extra needs of poor people in cities for all social services, including education, often have a negative effect on the attitudes of legislators when they deal with cities and city school districts.

To treat the political and organizational dynamics in urban-state relationships in education we shall (1) discuss some of the constraints of the past, (2) look at conditions which now require re-examination of these constraints, (3) posit an emerging role for state education agencies as they work with cities, and (4) suggest some implications for both state education agencies and city school districts if relationships are to be made more effective.

Constraints of the Past

A number of conditions have characterized cities and city school

---

*Prepared by *Roald F. Campbell*, Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration, and *Lonnie H. Wagstaff*, Assistant Professor of Educational Administration and Director, Urban Educational Leadership Program, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

districts over the past several decades. It is important to recognize that cities have long cherished their autonomy. Frequently, this state of mind is caught up in the phrase, "home rule." Even though city government is authorized by state action, there is rather wide-spread belief that cities should have considerable leeway in determining their own destiny.

The City Condition

City autonomy generally has been extended to city school districts. Indeed, city school districts may be even more independent of state structures than the cities themselves. School districts generally have been found by the courts to be quasi-municipal corporations created by the state to carry on a function delegated to them by the state. As such, these bodies are not subdivisions of the cities nor subject to their control, except in limited ways. In many states the city school districts have been set apart from school districts generally by other designations of autonomy. City school districts in Idaho, for instance, were designated "independent class A" school districts. In Illinois, some 14 city school districts were given special charters which distinguished them from other school districts and bestowed upon them some additional autonomy. In Ohio, three classes of school districts were established: local, exempted village (exempted from county jurisdiction), and city school districts. Again, by implication and by specific provision city school districts were given greater autonomy than other districts.

Frequently, this autonomy meant that city school districts were free to establish their own courses of study and to select their own textbooks, whereas in many states other school districts were subject to some state or county supervision in these areas. A few large cities, such as New York and Chicago, were also given power to certify their own personnel. This means the establishment of their own examination boards and certification procedures, quite independent of state arrangements for certification. City certification in New York has become the focus of controversy in that city.

Political or governmental autonomy in city school districts has aided and abetted the growth of powerful professional hierarchies. Clearly, grants of autonomy, such as course of study development and certification procedures, must be administered. Moreover, in a large city school district such administration represents extensive, complex, and ongoing operations. These duties became too onerous for laymen or for lay board members, hence full time professionals were designated to plan and implement the various tasks. In time, these professionals ascribed some kind of esoteric knowledge to their jobs. For instance, much of the specialized knowledge of the testing movement has been applied to certain aspects of examination procedures for personnel. As these procedures became more specialized–more esoteric–lay board members found themselves less and less able to understand the details of the processes being employed and thus quite incapable of judging their appropriateness and effectiveness.

This condition left the field to the professionals. Sometimes the professionals in city school districts were so protected by their political autonomy that they were not even subject to the scrutiny of their fellow professionals outside of city school districts. All of this created a potential for abuse. The professionals in the hierarchy of the city school district became pretty much a law unto themselves. There was the ever present temptation to *value the process and forget the ends the process was designed to serve*. At times, complacency seemed to prevent the search for new professional insights which might have suggested modifications in practice. And on occasions the professionals seemed to become picayune and even vindictive in the application of their craft.

But there was another hierarchy in the big city school district. This was found in the organizations created by teachers and administrators. Many of the practices of the official hierarchy affected teachers and principals, hence they became, in many cases, the only astute critics of administrative policies and procedures. This criticism was often motivated by personal concern—a condition not limited to professionals in education. Over time, these personal concerns, often tempered by professional realities, became a major influence upon the official hierarchy. Thus, the autonomy of city school districts tended to reflect the special interests of teachers and administrators as expressed through official channels and as influenced by professional organizations. Little wonder that laymen, affected by but not able to influence the system, came to resent this condition.

But our discussion about city school district autonomy above and some of its abuses should not detract from the fact that for several decades city schools were the leaders in the development or improvement of educational practice in this country. City school superintendents such as Harris of St. Louis, McAndrew of Chicago, Maxwell of New York, and Spaulding of Minneapolis and Cleveland became powerful figures in American education. It was in city school districts that graded schools were developed, that departmentalized teaching was evolved, that homogeneous grouping was practiced, that graded courses of study were prepared, that achievement tests in each of the school subjects were developed, and that the training and selection of teachers was made more rigorous.

Two conditions made these and other achievements possible. In city school districts there were many pupils, teachers, and individual schools. Experiments requiring economy of scale were possible under these conditions. Moreover, through the first half of this century the city districts were the wealthy districts and money was available for experimentation and innovation. This was during the period before industry began to move out of the cities and many poor people began to move into them.

Since cities were frontrunners in education, their leaders saw little point in looking to the state for direction. As a matter of fact, the conditions in state education agencies, as we shall note later, were such as to command little respect from city or other large school districts. With

some notable early exceptions, state superintendents seemed quite inept when compared with large city superintendents. State departments seemed to be preoccupied with bringing up the bottom of the educational system and not concerned about collaborating with the top of the system as found in the cities. In short, most city school districts looked with some disdain upon state departments of education.

These differences between city and state education agencies were reflected in the development of educational administration as a professional field of study. Under the influence of such persons as Strayer at Teachers College, Columbia University and Cubberley at Stanford University educational administration came to mean local school administration, essentially focused on the duties of the local superintendent of schools. The duties of local superintendents, and especially of city superintendents, were analyzed and courses designed to train neophytes in these duties were established. Little attention was paid to organizational theory, a concern that began to appear in such emerging disciplines as sociology and political science, or to administrative practice in such fields as business and government. While Cubberley gave some attention to state school administration, most of his colleagues seemed quite content to ignore administration except in the local school setting.

Iannaccone[1]* has examined urban-state relationships and developed three norms or generalizations designed to characterize these relationships. First, he concluded, city school districts have to initiate action designed to change the nature of urban-state relationships. In other words, the state education agencies, for the most part, seemed willing to accept the status quo. Second, any educational initiative on the part of the cities is converted into a political problem or issue. This situation may reflect a closer relationship betwen school governance and general governance in cities than in rural areas or it may depict an ingredient found necessary in moving a rural legislature. Third, the educational initiative taken by city districts requires a high degree of unity among all of the forces in the city. Again, this may be the only way a rural legislature can be influenced. The norms advanced by Iannaccone seem quite plausible and not unrelated to what we noted above about the city condition.

The State Condition

Thus far we have presented only half of the picture; we must also look at the state condition as it has existed over much of this century. We have already alluded to the fact that most state legislatures were dominated by members from rural areas and small towns. While many states had constitutional provisions requiring reapportionment of legislative districts, these requirements were frequently ignored. Finally, this abuse became so patent in Tennessee that in 1962 a case was carried to the U. S. Supreme Court and led to the now famous "one man one vote" decision.[2] In a sense, the highest court of the land had to insist that Tennessee obey its own constitutional provisions. The decision has obviously

*Footnote references are given at end of the chapter.

affected reapportionment practices in many other states and suggests the serious abuses which had been allowed to persist.

Just as state legislatures have been rural in orientation, so have state departments of education. In a rather careful examination of personnel in three state departments of education[3] Campbell and his associates found that most of the professionals in these departments had blue collar or farm backgrounds and had lived in towns or small cities most of their lifetime. This is not surprising. Most state departments have used the rural schools as the pool for their manpower requirements. Nor was this practice entirely dysfunctional. As long as the state departments were serving chiefly rural schools the recruitment of some of the best persons from those schools seemed to be a logical and desirable practice. The problem came when persons with rural backgrounds, experience, and attitudes attempted to deal with statewide responsibilities including relationships with urban school systems. The disdain of state departments, common to personnel in city school districts, was further exacerbated when state departments were represented by staff members who seemed to have little understanding and perhaps little concern about urban problems.

A second long-standing characteristic of state departments of education has been their tendency to deal mainly with regulatory functions. This is quite understandable. Each legislative session tended to mandate that certain things be done. Thus, teacher certification, for the most part, has become a state function. The distribution of state financial aid to school districts has been placed in the domain of the state department. In some states the development of courses of study and the selection of textbooks have become state education agency or department functions. In a few states responsibility for the development of school plant standards has been assigned to state departments. In the exercise of these and similar functions, most state departments have attempted to carry out the intent of the law. Less frequently have these departments been instrumental in influencing the public and the legislature to pass desirable laws in the first instance. In other words, *state departments have tended to exercise a maintenance and not a leadership role in education.*

We do not disparage the maintenance role. Indeed, this is important! It should be done well. However, when maintenance and regulation become the consuming concerns of state departments, there is little opportunity for leadership, for reconception, or for reform. What has happened to cities since World War II demands analysis and the development of new programs. It is under these circumstances that the regulatory role is found to be most deficient.

Persons with rural orientations, whether in state departments of education, in the legislature, or more generally, often look upon cities as atypical and even wicked. This is not a new phenomenon. Jefferson was of the opinion that communities had to remain small if we were to make self-government work. All of us have at times hungered for space, fresh air, fewer people, and more time for meditation. Cities mitigate against

nearly all of these sylvan desires; they are crowded, busy, and exacting of persons who live in them. In cities we find poverty, crime, and dirt. The presence of these conditions blinds many persons with rural orientations to the fact that cities are also the centers of industry and of art, music, and learning.

Another part of the state condition has to do with the political orientation of people. Rural areas and small towns, particularly in the North and West tend to be Republican, while cities tend to be Democratic. Thus, up-state New York is usually Republican and New York City is often Democratic. Down-state Illinois is ordinarily Republican and Chicago is Democratic. These party affiliations tend to reinforce the split between persons with rural backgrounds in legislatures and state departments of education and persons in urban school districts.

Nor has reapportionment, to which we already referred, given cities much more voice in state legislatures. Large central cities have tended to lose population, whereas the suburban rings around the cities have grown. Hauser and Taitel have projected a continuation of this trend and estimated that 100 million of the projected 170 million metropolitan area residents in 1980 will live in suburbs.[4] As a result of suburban growth much of the change in state legislatures has been in the reduction of rural members and the increase of suburban members, frequently with little change in representation from the central cities. Suburban members differ somewhat from their rural brethren but many of them are refugees from the central city and are confronted with the necessity of meeting high mortgage payments on their new homes and with high taxes for public services in their new communities. Even though many of these suburbanites do business in the central city, they frequently have little concern about its social and educational problems.

As we review the city condition over much of this century, we note that cities and city school districts sought and gained great autonomy and the ready acceptance of that state of affairs by state bodies. We sense that cities and city school districts have a proud history, but this pride has frequently been seen as arrogance by state agencies. We see cities with heterogeneous populations and all the problems and possibilities that arise in dealing with diverse groups, but these diversities and their problems have frequently been viewed by the more homogeneous rural folks of the state with suspicion and even hostility. In short, there has been little basis for collaboration between state departments of education and urban school systems.

Change Is Essential

But the conditions affecting urban-state relations over much of this century have changed and will continue to change as we shall now point out.

Most Cities Are in Serious Financial Straits

Many central cities appear to be facing bankruptcy. They do not

have money to provide needed social services such as fire and police protection, sanitation, and health. Many city school districts are also broke, or nearly so. Unless state and federal aid is increased substantially they cannot operate. This condition stems from two principal developments. The first of these is the decentralization of industry. Much of the industry has moved or is moving to smaller communities, some of which are near the central cities. One can drive the by-pass around any large city and count the industrial plants by the hundreds that prior to World War II would probably have been located in the central city.

With trucks and good highways, industrial plants can be located where land is more plentiful and often where taxes are less onerous. The same roads that accommodate the trucks also permit the workers to drive to the plants, as most of them do, from within a radius of at least fifty miles. The removal of industry from the city has eroded in a serious manner the tax base of the cities.

Along with the industrial decentralization of cities has come a shift in the composition of their population. Middle and upper economic income people, mostly white, have migrated to the suburbs. Lower economic income people, often black, Puerto Rican, Mexican American, or Appalachian, have moved into the cities. These movements have permitted the middle economic class to keep their jobs in the city where most of them work, even though they live in the suburbs. Again, however, the tax base represented by middle class homes has been lost to the city.

Blacks and other poor people, for the most part, have had no place to go but the central city. There they could, at times, find cheaper housing—cheaper because it was more crowded, antiquated, or badly run down. Even when the housing was not cheaper, there was frequently no alternative to the central city simply because housing in other areas was not open to blacks and other minority groups. It is not our purpose here to elaborate on these injustices but it should be clear that poor people in poor housing do not add much to the tax base available to cities and city school districts.

With industry and middle and upper income whites moving out of the cities and with the poor moving into the cities, the condition often called "municipal overburden" has been extenuated. Poor people have greater social needs. Decrepit housing, crime, and other social ills mean greater demands for fire and police protection, for sanitation, for health service, for welfare assistance, and for appropriate education, including considerable attention to preschool and remedial education. In other words, it costs more public money per person to service poor people who live in squalor and who are frequently unemployed than it does to serve middle class people. Since education is not the only public service costing more, city school districts must compete with the other social services for their extra tax dollars. There seems to be a growing consciousness of the fact that the crises confronting big cities are not entirely of big city making and, moreover, that the consequences of such conditions affect the entire society.

Demand for City School Reform

A second change of the last decade or two is the demand for reform in cities and city school systems. One aspect of this reform has been the movement toward decentralization. This movement has perhaps been more definitive in New York where 31 relatively autonomous elementary school districts have been created. The action in Detroit has also been notable with the creation of regional boards of education and the continuation of an overall board. Decentralization has a number of purposes. It is seen as a way of breaking up a rigid hierarchy into a number of units with the hope that each of the several units will have considerable flexibility in decision making. It is also seen as a way of eliciting greater participation on the part of community residents in deciding ther own destinies in education.

Clearly, the great inflexibility of most city school districts has motivated much of the emphasis on decentralization. Demands for more openness, for re-examination of current policies and programs, and for changes in structure and operation have frequently been made by minority groups. The Oceanhill-Brownsville struggle in New York City has received nationwide attention.[5] Frequently, minority groups have contended that the curriculum is unsatisfactory, that instructional procedures are biased, that personnel practices are discriminatory, and that slum schools get the short end of the budget. When these groups have sought changes they frequently get no redress at the city district level, and hence, they "buck-up" the problem to the state for action. For instance, state action was taken in both the New York and Michigan cases. It should also be noted that the state has the power, indeed the obligation, to take action.

Federal Support for States

At times during the past decade there has been some tendency to establish for some educational programs direct relationship between federal agencies and large city school districts. Because of the political make-up of cities, this disposition has probably been more characteristic of Democratic administrations than of Republican administrations. Overall, however, federal support tends to be channeled through state agencies. While the administration of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), under state jurisdiction may be somewhat nominal in nature, such funds are distributed through state education agencies.

At one time Title III, ESEA, funds were distributed directly by the U. S. Office of Education to school districts. However, that practice was changed and states were made responsible not only for the distribution of the money but also for the evaluation of all proposals and the selection of those for which funds were to be made available. This shift was in keeping with the long-range policy of the federal government, particularly in education, to strengthen state education agencies. Actually, Title V of ESEA was designed specifically with that objective in mind. Under its provisions state departments of education could obtain federal funds for

their own improvement, especially in the areas of planning and evaluation. In recent years, state education agencies have actually received almost half of their support from federal sources.[6]

The general disposition of the federal government to channel support through state agencies instead of directly to local school districts is given further emphasis in the various plans now under consideration for increased federal support.

Actually, much of the money proposed by the President is to go to the governors of the states under the assumption that they and state legislatures are in a better position to allocate the funds to education and to other functions than is the Congress. These developments seem to make it quite clear that large city school districts in the future will be required to look to state agencies for increased revenues.

Full State Funding

The Serrano[7] case in California, similar decisions in other states, and very recently a U. S. District Court decision in Texas[8] have moved the support of education substantially toward the concept of full state funding. In essence, these decisions contend that present provisions for school support, based largely on the local property tax, mitigate against equal educational opportunity. As was noted in the Serrano decision the present method of financing schools "denies to the plaintiffs and others similarly situated the equal protection of the laws."

Since the courts are now contending that the wealth of parents and neighbors cannot be the chief determinant of the amount of money available for the schooling of youngsters, another form of tax support must be devised. Without going into detail about support programs that would meet the constitutional test required by the courts, it seems quite clear that one aspect of any such plan will require that states collect most, if not all, of the tax revenues and distribute them back to the school districts in some equitable manner. Again, the need for a new and augmented role of the state and the state education agency in the support and direction of education, even in urban school districts, is apparent.

Financing Alternative Schools

Many states have recently enacted legislation which would aid nonpublic schools in one or more ways. In the past, aid was frequently provided for textbooks, for transportation, and other ancillary services, following the doctrine of "child benefit" first enunciated in the Cochran case.[9] More recently, some states have also authorized aid to teachers or for instruction in secular subjects in nonpublic schools. This development suffered at least a temporary setback in the Lemon case[10] when programs in nonpublic schools in three states were declared unconstitutional. In our judgment, this decision will require some change of strategy on the part of nonpublic schools but we think that judicial precedent and political support are such that new ways of channeling state support to nonpublic schools will be proposed.

Additional support for this judgment is found in the disenchantment with public education on the part of some leaders and the consequent search for alternatives to public education. We are not entirely in sympathy with this disenchantment but we do recognize that it exists. Nonpublic schools have long been such an alternative. While, overall, the record of nonpublic schools is probably no better than the record of public schools, their role as an alternative to public schools is getting new emphasis and apparently more widespread support and this support is being expressed in state legislatures.

Other alternatives to public schools such as street academies and small informal schools have received wide publicity in the public press. For instance, a recent issue of *Saturday Review* devoted the cover to pictures of the heads of four New York "mini-schools" and included a substantial article about them.[11] Both federal and state funds were used to support these schools. At the urging of many citizens, including the Urban Coalition, these schools were organized as trial efforts to see what could be done in small, less formal institutions. In the search for alternatives to public education or for the reform of public education, we believe that state education agencies will need to be able to consider and recommend legal bases for defensible and appropriate alternatives. However, primary attention should be given to systematically planned renewal of public education.

Need for Planning and Evaluation

As was noted earlier, most state education agencies over much of this century were content to be low-profile organizations concerned chiefly with maintenance functions which tended to include the application of non-threatening regulations to the school districts of the state. For the most part, city school districts exceeded, at least in easily measurable criteria, those regulations—such as the minimum days in the school term and hours of college credit required of teachers—hence the impact of such regulations was seldom felt by them. But, as we have pointed out, a new day has dawned. Urban school programs can no longer be taken for granted, money for the operation of urban schools is in short supply, and the organizational arrangements of city school districts have been called into question. In short, governors, state legislatures, and state education agencies are being required to examine urban school policies and practices.

In all of these instances it becomes increasingly clear that the old autonomy of urban school districts is no longer tenable. The state must exercise surveillance over these one time autonomous units. In some states, this movement has led to state-wide assessment programs. In many states, studies of long-term needs for education have been made. In a number of states, there has been experimentation with management information systems and an attempt to provide more adequate information for decision making on the part of governors, legislators, and state education agencies. In nearly all states, the need for long-term planning and continuous evaluation has become evident.

We are convinced that changes such as those noted above will bring a new set of urban-state relationships. We suspect there will be considerable pain in this process. Under the best of circumstances we think these new relationships can become productive. Under the worst of circumstances they may well be disruptive.

In the next section we suggest more specifically what we believe the new role of the state education agency should be and how this new role can be implemented. We have no doubt that the long standing legal responsibility of the state for public education will become real and not merely nominal.

The Emerging State Role

The hard facts of history have taught us that education is more than just a local function with local results. As with other functions, education is interdependent, interlocking, and affects and is affected by the push and pull of the major social forces of the society. In short, education is part of a larger social system, as noted earlier.

National recognition of the interdependent and interlocking nature of education led to the development and enactment of of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Since that time the pervasive nature of urban educational problems has been recognized and urgently voiced by the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education:

> . . . in recognition of the crisis existing in Metropolitan areas, [we] recommend that the Congress provide substantial funds to supplement those available under section 505, Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act, to enable a number of State education agencies to demonstrate alternative methods of equipping themselves to cope with critical urban educational problems . . .[12]

With the infusion of new money through Title V, some state agencies have moved to provide competent leadership and helpful service to local school districts. They have tended to reduce their preoccupation with educational statistics, rules and regulations, and deal increasingly with the essential and complex problems generated by new social forces, and new ideas and directions in education. Several have established planning, research, and evaluation divisions, but some of these divisions, thus far, have been established in name only, and frequently serve only the in-house function of generating proposals for new money or as sorting and reporting stations for other federal programs.

We see the emerging role of state agencies as a proactive one. States should help local school districts—and especially urban districts—to understand and find solutions to the social, economic, racial, and cultural problems which beleaguer them. Presently, it seems crucial that state education agencies and urban school districts join forces to: (a) launch comprehensive planning, research, and evaluation programs; (b) reconsider organizational structures; (c) relate education to other social and economic programs; (d) promote curricular experimentation; (e) revise training

and certification requirements; (f) improve in-service education; and (g) develop comprehensive support programs. What follows is an elaboration of each of these areas and the implications they hold for the program efforts of state education agencies.

Planning and Evaluation

There are no shortcut methods to finding solutions to the complex problems of urban education. They require intensive study and sizable resources. Urban school districts do not have the resources to plan and mount programs for the urgently needed relief. They are often stymied by state imposed ceilings on their taxing power and state equalization formulas computed on a per student basis which, in fact, reflect a distinct rural-suburban bias. Since this fiscal bind is state devised and state imposed, the state must provide the means to relieve it.

Making more money available on an equitable basis is one way for states to help many urban schools toward becoming viable educational institutions again. It should not be assumed, however, that money alone will solve the problems. The need for the collaborative use of state and local resources appears to be of greater urgency, and may, indeed, lead to more productive results.

School districts can hardly be expected to develop elaborate and sophisticated planning, research, and evaluation divisions when their budgetary process allows little free or unencumbered money. Currently, some 80 to 90 percent of a city school budget is allocated for salaries. Building maintenance and school supplies and equipment requ re almost all of the remaining percentage of the budget. This fixed budgetary condition, combined with continuing salary demands, makes it almost impossible for school districts to engage in planning and evaluation activities which may hold the most promise for finding solutions to their problems. Moreover, for some activities the school district is not the place for overall educational planning, research, and evaluation. Many aspects of education must be viewed and evaluated in a context larger than that of a local school district regardless of its size. Since education is a state function, some problems must be viewed and evaluated within the total state context.

We do have some "futures" forecasting capability and ought to use it to help schools prepare for changing demands and conditions.[13] There may be the possibility and need to intervene and bring forth a less hostile future. Determining trends in population growth and settlement, periods of economic growth and decline, changes in public mood, and the likely impact of court decisions are forecast data of immense potential use to school districts. For many of these projections it would be wasteful and inappropriate for individual districts to tool-up to generate the data when it can be centrally generated, analyzed, and shared.

The need for state-wide planning, research, and evaluation is great. We have hardly scratched the surface in researching many very critical problem areas which bear directly on the quality of education provided

in our schools. Moreover, we have not developed an effective delivery system to acquaint schools with the results of the little research we presently do. State education agencies need to develop a capability to fill the planning, research, and evaluation vacuum in education. Additionally, they need to develop a process of dissemination which permits all schools to have access to the data and information produced.

Reconsideration of Organizational Structure

After decades of effort to build public sentiment for school district centralization, we now find compelling reasons to reverse this position and push for decentralization in our large cities. Decentralization plans can be found in varying stages of development in such cities as New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Newark, and Washington, D. C.

We have found that some functions are best served through centralization, others are not. Mechanical and non-people oriented functions—including purchasing, data processing, warehousing, transportation—can be performed more effectively and efficiently on a centralized basis. People oriented functions—such as counseling, conferencing, establishing good human and community relations—are done more effectively on a decentralized basis. Moreover, school patrons are demanding that they get to see, know, and cooperate with their teachers and administrators. Schools must be organized to respond to that demand.

It is difficult to find logic in the configuration of many school districts. School districts perhaps are among the few structures modern man has devised which do not reflect rational size, shape, or form. Frequently the boundary of a city school district and the municipality are not coterminous. Although state legislatures hold full power over the schools, the "myth" of local control is still strong and stirs the passions of the citizenry and gets reaffirmed by the actions of state legislators. It appears that sentiment has been the guiding hand, more often than not, in the structuring of school districts.

State education agencies are often empowered by statute to help resolve matters pertaining to school district organization. They and the state legislatures might well consider that districts need latitude to try new organizational designs. The question of optimum size remains unresolved. Yet there are convincing reasons to allow some districts to sub-divide, merge, combine resources and functions, and try a range of combinational arrangements. The combinational plans could vary from the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) established by the state of New York to the Metropolitan Education District of Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee.

The legislature of New York permitted BOCES[14] to develop as a vehicle for small school districts to share the cost of teacher specialists in such areas as art, music, and counseling. Since that time, the BOCES have developed new capabilities and notable programs which include special education, vocational education, curriculum and instructional services, and non-instructional services.

The basis for the establishment of the Nashville-Davidson County Metropolitan School System[15] was provided through enabling legislation enacted by the Tennessee legislature with city and county approval by referendum. Since its establishment, the Metropolitan School System has eliminated the problems of jurisdictional determination and significantly reduced the fragmentary approach to community planning and development. The school system is perceived as a subsystem of the larger community and close working relationships are made possible between it and departments of the metropolitan municipal government. For example, the long-range plan for the development of the physical facilities for the school system was the result of the cooperative effort of the Metropolitan Planning Commission (Municipal) and the Metropolitan Transitional Board of Education. Since a primary function of the Metropolitan Planning Commission is that of systematically gathering, analyzing, and using data on land use, population, housing, transportation, the economic base, and other information related to an understanding of the community, the cooperative use of these data for educational planning was a major step in the direction of eliminating duplicate efforts as well as that of building viable school-community linkages.

These two illustrations do not by any means exhaust the combinational possibilities. Others could be developed to: (a) reduce or eliminate racial isolation; (b) reduce the costs for specialized programs; and (c) begin the process of eradicating the generally parochial view of education which mitigates against the range and quality of services provided both the young and adult members of the society. Local districts, subdistricts, BOCES, metro-districts, service units, and other alternative arrangements all hold the potential for useful service as organizational structures. The challenge is to be able to use one or the other or a combination of these to improve the delivery of educational services to clients. Too often school districts find themselves hamstrung by state statutes and must continue to plod along with organizational structures inadequate to demands for action and flexibility.

The organizational structure of a single school also needs to be examined. Some people find it difficult to learn in a school regimen. Rigid time and place requirements do not fit their life styles. Store front schools, schools without walls, freedom schools, and mini-schools[16] are appearing with increasing frequency. Alternatives to present school arrangements have been seriously considered in several recent publications.[17] It seems possible for schools to have several forms and still be responsible educational institutions.

We believe that state agencies should take the leadership in supporting new and creative organizational structures for both school districts and schools. Such questions as optimum size, impersonalization and depersonalization, participatory arrangements, and communication should be answered. Moreover, legislatures and citizens must be convinced that whatever action taken is just and sound. Only state agencies are in the position of having the overall picture of education within their respective states. This overall view is requisite to the development of sound recom-

mendations for organizational changes. We suggest that the development and support of possible alternative structures is a state responsibility.

Relation of Education to Other Social and Economic Programs

We have spoken of the interdependent and interlocking nature of our society. Yet, there is frequently an absence of any cooperative pattern of linkage between school districts, other units of urban government, state education agencies, the USOE, and colleges and universities. There is also the failure to relate education to other social and economic programs. It appears to be good strategy to attack difficult problems from several sides and perspectives and there is clearly great advantage in combined efforts. Local, state, and federal agencies with similar goals and purposes can significantly reduce program conflict and redundancy if they cooperatively determine who will do what and how resources will be deployed. Random effort produces a hodge-podge which is difficult to assess in terms of programmatic impact. The point is well made by the Illinois Commission on Urban Education in its recent report:

> The Commission of Urban Education recognizes the resources and potential for change presently available through the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the regional service centers, and other existing state agencies concerned with urban schooling. The fact that multiple resources are available and that multiple agencies are involved may be the curse of urban problems. Uncoordinated and splintered efforts to cure urban ailments may cause more problems than they cure. Urban education in Illinois is the concern of many but the responsibility of no one.[18]

Illinois is not atypical. According to a recent survey we conducted, only 10 out of 38 states responding had organized programs or departments of urban education to link themselves effectively with their urban school districts. Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and Texas are among states that have taken initiative in this direction. Even fewer states appear to have attempted to relate education to other social and economic programs. As one example of collaboration, two states, Ohio and New Jersey, have developed a working relationship with model cities of the state to provide on-site technical assistance to them.

Model cities programs are merely representative of the host of programs found in cities. Manpower development programs, youth centered programs, early childhood programs could all be strengthened if they were coordinated and funds used according to intensity of need. Moreover, the real needs could be uncovered and attacked with sufficient resources if these needs were viewed as multi-dimensional rather than unidimensional impediments to human growth and development. For example, manpower development programs are really educational programs. The fiscal resources for manpower and education programs could be used more effectively if physical facilities were not unnecessarily duplicated. Facilities for one program are often purchased or rented while facilities for the other program stand idle much of the time. Faculty and staff are recruited and trained in each agency without regard for the knowledge and expertise of the other.

We believe the decision of the Ohio and New Jersey Departments

of Education to relate to model cities programs across their states is indicative of what all state agencies should begin to do with social and economic programs in their respective states. Building these linkages assures a greater impact on urban school problems.

Promotion of Curricular Experimentation and Reform

For decades we have contended that education should meet the needs of children and youth. The objective has come more easily than the achievement. More and more we become painfully aware that we have not dealt adequately with these needs nor can we do so until we redesign and reform our curriculums. The situation is most critical in our urban centers where each year we turn out large numbers of functional illiterates.

Contemporary educational critics have rather harshly described the nature and form of public education. Some of them depict schools as dull, mindless, and melancholy places where students would rather not be.[19] The description is particularly apropos to the conditions currently reported to exist in many urban schools. Few educators will argue against the need for educational reform. There is widespread agreement that answers must be found for basic educational questions, such as: How do youngsters learn? Under what conditions do they tend to learn, or not to learn? How can they be taught? Cliches and empty slogans no longer suffice. It does no good to say that "Every youngster has a right to read" if none of his teachers can help him learn how to read and understand.

We have previously noted the fiscal plight of city school districts. These districts are fiscally unable to mount the large scale curriculum evaluation and experimentation programs sorely needed to develop educational programs which are meaningful to most, if not all, of the students in public schools. State level action is necessary before comprehensive curriculum reform can be achieved.

If education is to be the enriching experience it can and should be, reform cannot be left to chance. Nor should it be allowed to develop like "Topsy." The purpose and direction of reform are key decisions to which state agencies should give leadership. They could begin by determining the cultural relevance of curricular offerings across the state. Ours is a pluralistic society and the characteristics of the society ought to be reflected in the curriculums of our schools. Each youngster enrolled in a school has a right to be able to identify, by virtue of race and ethnicity, with the characters and events used to teach him. To deny him this right is to deny him a real opportunity to learn. Moreover, each youngster should learn to respect and appreciate the heterogeneous nature of the society. The achievement of these two goals alone would have far reaching implications for our schools and our society.

We see the role of the state education agency in curricular experimentation as one of leadership to effect needed changes. This involves mounting experimental programs, involving local school district personnel in the planning and development of the programs, and disseminating the

result of the experimental efforts. Equally important in this leadership role is the development of a statewide climate that encourages experimentation and implementation of needed changes.

Revision of Preparation and Certification Requirements

Schools can be no better than the people who staff them. By traditional standards teachers and administrators are better educated and trained than in any period in our history. The bachelor's degree is almost universally held and graduate degrees are becoming commonplace. Most of our states have established minimum academic and experience requirements for teacher and administrator certification. Within our schools, however, especially those in urban environs, there often seems to be little correlation between improved or more professional training and the quality of education provided students.

These developments give us reason to pause and become concerned about what teachers are able to do and how well prepared beginning teachers really are. Hard data on the performance of beginning teachers are not available. Neither do we have valid effectiveness criteria with which the data can be secured. We might, however, infer from teacher turnover and dropout statistics that some do not believe themselves to be very successful. This condition is not only evidenced among teachers, but also among administrators and paraprofessionals.

State education agencies should examine the general nature of preparation and certification. [20] How valid is general certification which says in effect that a teacher is able to teach in rural, suburban, and urban schools? The life styles, expectations, and dynamics of human interaction are quite different in these communities. How significant is this difference? Ought it be reflected in the way we prepare and certify teachers? These and other questions loom before us and require the development and testing of alternative modes of preparation and certification. These modes should be concerned with performance criteria and not mere credit accumulation.

The responsibility for the development and implementation of criteria for teacher preparation and certification is located in state education agencies. They, therefore, have a leadership role in testing the viability of the existing patterns of training and certification and, if these prove to be ineffective, in developing new ones. The state of Washington has recently reported a significant move in the development of performance criteria.[21] We suspect that urban schools are in need of a new breed of educators—teachers, administrators, and paraprofessional—and state agencies should be examining and determining, with the help of others, ways by which this need can be met.

Provision for In-service Education

In-service education is central to our ability to resolve the problems in our urban schools. Many of our present practices are in need of change and reform. Schools are attempting to respond to their critics—but *if*

teachers do not change schools cannot. Since we cannot dismiss the present teaching and administrative force in toto, in-service education seems to be a necessary approach to our problem.

In-service education is a long neglected area of education. Its existence and form varies in many ways but the results of the often haphazard efforts appear to be the same: little lasting effect on the individual and even less on his job performance. No substantial time, money, or resources are systematically allocated for in-service education in most school districts. In some districts there is no program. The function is usually tacked onto the job description of the principal but it is unrealistic to believe he can be effective when faced with other urgent problems and few, if any, resources. Compounding the in-service problem is the almost universal expectation, some federal programs excepted, that teachers pay for continuing their growth and development from their own pockets. Seemingly, a more realistic approach is currently under development in the educational renewal center concept, now sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education.

Some other groups and organizations—the military, industry, agriculture and the health sciences—appear to have had more fruitful results from in-service efforts. Perhaps we can learn something from them. And as part of that learning we can reconceptualize our own approach and utilize more fully what we know about teaching and learning.

State education agencies should move forthrightly to obtain the cooperation of local school systems and institutions of higher learning in order to improve the nature and quality of in-service education for school personnel. The initial move should be that of changing certification policies and requirements which impede collaborative arrangements with other agencies. The second action should be the establishment of a division of continuing education with power and resources to help school personnel understand and repair their deficiencies. Beyond this, the division should engage in research and program development in the education of adults which leads to challenging and mind-stretching experiences for school people as adult learners. Education more and more must become a lifelong effort for more and more people. The adult learner is quite different from the young learner and we need more knowledge about him and more skill to deal effectively with him. These efforts should lead to collaboration with local districts and universities and adequate financial support for in-service programs.

Development of Comprehensive Support Programs

Another of education's glaring deficiencies can be found in the way fiscal resources are obtained and allocated. Over-funded and under-funded school districts exist side by side. A quirk of fate or a backroom conversation can decide the level of funding available to many youngsters. Power politics, prejudice and racism stand out as potent decisive forces when the division of tax resources for education in cities is examined. Chance too often determines whether or not adequate resources are provided for education.

As pointed out in the next chapter, knowledgeable professionals and laymen alike know that the property tax is no longer an adequate revenue base for education. Taxpayers all over the country are rebelling against this form of taxation and schools in turn are facing bankruptcy and closing. The question of finance begs for solution and the one alternative which seems to hold the potential for being equitable is the state collection and distribution of fiscal resources or even full state funding.

Full state funding is a system of financing schools which utilizes the total educational tax base of a state in the fiscal support of the schools of the state. Under this system, the specious state/local distinction in the generation of education revenue is avoided. Wise[22] indicates that full state funding should provide equity both in educational taxation and in educational resource allocation. Further, resource allocation should not depend upon where a student lives, what his parental circumstances are, or how highly his neighbors value education.

Complete equity, however, is not inherent in full state funding alone; it must be built into the distribution formula. This fact has been cogently elaborated in a report of the National Educaional Finance Project.[23] Special needs must be recognized and funds provided for them over and above any per capita distribution. By way of illustration, Garms and Kelley have proposed a procedure which takes account of the socioeconomic characteristics of pupils and their school achievement. According to their proposal:

> . . . [A] school should be provided extra state money to the extent that it had in it students whose socioeconomic characteristics predict that they would achieve poorly under the present educational system . . . Using data on four variables we can predict 71 per cent of the variation in average school achievement, even though we know nothing about the instructional program in the individual schools. These variables are percentage of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the school, percentage of children from broken homes (homes where one or both of the parents is missing), average number of schools attended by the pupils during the last three years, and average years of schooling of the students' parents.[24]

State agencies must play a vital role in clarifying the reasons why at least substantially increased and equitable state funding is essential and in implementing the concept. Further attention is given to this matter in Chapter 4.

Some Implications

We are living in a period of trends and counter trends and nowhere is this more evident than in the educational arena. Educational traditions are being challenged by changing situations and mounting tensions. For example: we recognize the need to combine small school districts and the counter need to divide or decentralize large school districts; we push for greater citizen participation in school matters and at the same time we recognize the limitations of wide-spread unenlightened participation; we say the problems of education are enmeshed with the political, economic, and social forces of the larger society but we persist in trying to solve them in isolation; we insist upon local autonomy from a position of fiscal

dependence; and we accept the doctrine of local control and at the same time demand that the state exercise its power. The ambiguity of these positions has created a climate of uncertainty which has tended to increase frustration among citizens and to reduce their confidence in professional educators and education. Clearly, when citizens do not hold schools in high esteem, efforts to gain adequate resources to improve the quality and delivery of educational services often fail.

State Education Agencies Must Change

We believe it essential that state education agencies intervene in this situation and join forces with school districts and institutions of higher learning to (a) clarify educational problems for the general citizenry, and (b) combine their resources and efforts to resolve them. We recognize that this will be a new endeavor for most state agencies. Enmity, old wounds, and defunct prerogatives must be set aside and collaborative linkages established. An enormous amount of educational statesmanship will be required if anti-urban biases are to be overcome. But educational bureaucrats and the general citizenry must come to recognize that cities and states alike, do indeed, share a common destiny, and that education is crucial to the shape of that destiny.

There are many places in the educational arena where state education agencies can begin this intervention. We have identified and elaborated upon seven areas we feel are in need of state level leadership and assistance. We do not believe that school districts alone can develop and implement programs of sufficient magnitude in these areas to significantly change them. These programs require comprehensive planning and sizable resource allocations. They affect the warp and woof of education across the state. Therefore, logically they should become the responsibility of the state with collaboration from school districts and other appropriate agencies and groups.

Since problems are especially acute and resources are limited in urban school districts, we believe it important for many state education agencies to place their emphasis there, while not neglecting others. Collaborative arrangements with these districts around the seven areas we have identified or around more specific problems should be given the highest priority. The establishment of an urban education division or unit adequately staffed and dedicated to a mission of collaborative service, as has been done in several states, may be a necessary first step. Or, a definite urban emphasis in all of the divisions of the state agency with appropriate coordination, as appears to have been done in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Texas, may be another possibility.

We believe the reduction of fragmentation and isolation within the educational establishment is necessary. The new collaboration we propose with school districts seems to hold great potential. We must remind ourselves, however, that we do not yet have this collaboration, and that state education agencies have a great deal of tooling-up to do before they can become meaningful partners with school districts. We suggest that they begin immediately to:

- Disestablish their old image of regulators and build a new one in keeping with the new collaborative role.
- With appropriate collaboration, identify and seek to eliminate needlessly, restrictive legislation.
- Become proactive and pro-city by placing urban education problems on their agendas and giving them the highest priority for resource allocation.
- Develop a new kind of staff capable of generating new ideas and new approaches to the resolution of educational problems. Some of these persons might come from fields outside of education where a particular field of knowledge and expertise is more adequately developed. New perspectives might well be a basic part of the solution of educational problems.
- Improve the salary scale to attract and hold able staff. It is no secret that state superintendents generally earn much less money than superintendents of large school districts. The same holds true for lower echelon staff. Under these circumstances, it's only natural for the most capable educational leaders to gravitate to the large districts rather than to state positions. An improved salary schedule would tend to make state positions equally attractive.

City Districts Must Also Change

But state educational agencies cannot do the task alone, nor can they do it overnight. Attitudes of personnel in city school districts must also change. School people and lay citizens in cities must recognize that complete city autonomy is no longer realistic nor is it desirable. Just as fiscal resources are required at the state level, planning, research, development, demonstration, and evaluation activities are also required at the state level.

This new state of affairs does not mean or imply domination by state agencies. Nor should pride in local achievement in urban school districts be eliminated. What is needed is collaboration, not hostility or vying for prestige. City school districts should become part of the pool from which personnel for state departments of education are selected. In turn, movement of personnel from state departments to city school districts should be seen as a normal aspect of professional mobility. When statewide committees or task forces are created by state departments, they should include in their membership adequate representation from urban school districts.

In-service programs for teachers and administrators represent an important area for collaboration between state agencies and urban districts. Here again, the movement should not all be one way. State money might provide personnel of particular types not ordinarily available in city districts. Likewise, some personnel available in city districts might be used rather broadly as part of the staff for in-service efforts across the state. The important point is to recognize the critical need for the program, the

necessity to seek the best talent available, and the need to eliminate the local baronies which now limit such programs.

As part of the emergence of state departments to their rightful place in the total scheme of things, city districts should give up their own examination boards for the certification of personnel. These boards are already in disrepute in many quarters; they should be eliminated. If state certification divisions are not doing a good job, their operation should be improved not just for rural schools but for all schools. One avenue for improvement, necessary in most states, is a change from the accumulation of academic credit, as almost the sole basis for certification, to reliance on performance as the chief criterion for the certificate. If the prospective teacher or administrator is to work in an urban situation, the performance criteria should be related to that situation. The development of these performance criteria and their implementation provides an adequate challenge for the best of personnel in both state agencies and urban districts.

The collaboration we seek and urgently need between state education agencies and urban districts will not all come at once. Moreover, collaboration is not going to be achieved merely by the expression of good will. Trust between two agencies can be built only upon competence and forthright relationships. States cannot pose as having experts in urban affairs if they do not have them. But cities cannot assume that states have no competence if they have never attempted to test that competence. There are obligations on both sides. Each side must be willing to start and maintain communication with the other about how such efforts are going.

Interact With the Political System

A key area of collaboration between state education agencies and urban districts, as we have suggested above, is interaction with the political system. Some state agencies have done this well; some have not done it at all. Some urban school districts have engaged in such interaction at the local level but have been less effective at the state level. Overall, the interaction between education agencies and the political system has been inappropriate, inadequate, or ineffective. This condition probably results from the long tradition that schools are non-political, from the general ineptness of school people in the political arena, and from the division between state agencies and urban districts—a division easily exploited by political leaders. It is time for any such division to be reduced or eliminated and for greater political skill to be developed on the part of educational leaders at both state and city levels.

Perhaps basic to this change is the social systems concept, alluded to above. States and their subdivisions, including cities, are parts of the social system and of the political subsystem of the social system. This concept posits interrelationships among the units, not autonomy on the part of any unit, nor dominance at any level. The key is creative interaction. Interaction permits each unit to play a part, in fact obligates each unit to play its part. In the past, there has been something of a void at the state level, hence the local level (the city) exercised too much autonomy. The need to lessen and increase interaction is evident.

Not only is interaction important to state and local levels of governance, it is also essential to our federal system. Again, the relative void at the state level has permitted new forces at the national level to exercise too much influence. At times, urban school districts—distraught with inaction at the state level and in great need of federal money—have responded quickly to federal programs and in so doing made state education agencies appear to be even more incompetent. The more effective solution appears to reside in city-state solidarity in confronting the federal government. In that joining of forces, the interrelationships necessary in a federal system can become a reality; communication can flow both ways. While the development of this city-state solidarity will require much of both city districts and state education agencies, as we have suggested, the state, because of our governance arrangements, has a unique role to play in effecting this relationship.

In Summary

We have noted the organizational and political constraints of the past which seemed to prevent productive urban-state relationships. We have also pointed out that new conditions require that these constraints give way. We have posited an emerging role for state education agencies. While much is required of urban school districts if the new state role is to be implemented, an even greater obligation rests with state agencies and departments to establish collaborative relationships with the cities. We suggest that those relationships might begin with such program areas as the development of planning and evaluation capabilities, reconsideration of school district structures, relating education to other social and economic programs, the promotion of curriculum experimentation and reform, the revision of preparation and certification programs, the improvement of in-service education, and the development of a more equitable plan of financial support. For each of these areas we have suggested a few of the policies and strategies that might be employed. Improvement in these program areas will require, as we have emphasized, a better relationship between the educational and political structures of the states.

Footnote References

[1]Lawrence Iannaccone, "Norms Governing Urban-State Politics of Education," in Frank W. Lutz, ed., *Toward Improved Urban Education* (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970).

[2]Baker V. Carr, 369 U. S. 186.

[3]Roald F. Campbell, *et al*, eds., *Strengthening State Departments of Education* (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1967).

[4]Philip M. Hauser and Martin Taitel, "Population Trends—Prologue to Educational Programs," in Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, eds., *Prospective Changes in Society by 1980* (Denver, Colorado: Designing Education for the Future, 1967), p. 37. Republished by Citation Press, Scholastic Magazines, New York, N.Y.

[5]See, for example, Martin Mayer, *The Teachers Strike, New York 1968* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), and Marilyn Gittell and Mauriee Bembe, *Confrontation at Oceanhill-Brownsville* (New York: Frederick A. Prager, Inc., 1969).

[6]Mike M. Milstein, "The Federal Impact on State Education Agency Planning," *Planning & Changing*, II (April, 1971), pp. 31-38.

[7]Serrano v. Priest, Sup. 96 California Reporter 601 (1971).

[8]Reported in *The National Observer*, January 1, 1972.

[9]Cochran, *et al* v. Louisiana State Board of Education, *et al*, 281 U. S. 370 (1930).

[10]Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U. S. 602 (1971).

[11]Diane Divoky, "New York's Mini Schools," *Saturday Review*, December 18, 1971, pp. 60-67.

[12]The Fourth Annual Report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, *The State of State Departments of Education* (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 3.

[13]See Walter G. Hack, *et al, Educational Futurism 1985* (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1971).

[14]Joseph M. Cronin, *et al, Organizing and Governing Public Education in New York*. Unpublished report to the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, June, 1971, pp. 8-9.

[15]John H. Harris, *et al*, "School Reorganization in a Metropolitan Area: The Nashville Experience," in *Metropolitanism Its Challenge to Education*, Sixty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), pp. 352-283.

[16]Diane Divoky, *op. cit.*

[17]Daniel U. Levine and Robert J. Havighurst, eds., *Farewell to Schools???* (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1971).

[18]Final Report of Illinois Commission on Urban Education, *The Commission on Urban Education: A Report to the General Assembly of Illinois*. Unpublished document, 1971, pp. 7-8.

[19]Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1970).

[20]See, for example, Marshall L. Frinks, *Planning and Effecting Improvements in the Preparation and Certification of Teachers* (Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1971).

[21]Theodore E. Andrews, *New Directions in Certification*. Report of a Study Sponsored by the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education in the State of Washington (Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1971). Republished by the Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D. C.

[22]Arthur E. Wise, *A Responsible Plan for Public School Finance in Maryland*. A Report Prepared for the Citizens' Commission on Maryland Government. September, 1971, p. 2.

[23]Roe L. Johns, *et al, Alternative Programs for Financing Education* (Gainesville, Florida: National Educational Finance Project–Vol. 5, 1971), pp. 237-251.

[24]Walter I. Garms and James A. Kelly, "Financing Urban Education," in *Toward Improved Urban Education*, Frank W. Lutz, ed. (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 269-270.

Chapter 4

Improving Provisions For Organization, Housing, Financial Support and Accountability*

From a long-range point of view, it may be fortunate that many people throughout the nation have become concerned about deficiencies in educational programs and learning opportunities, in provisions for the structure and financing of education, and apparently in many aspects of life in the big cities. On the other hand, teacher strikes, shortened school terms, tax revolts, the lack of adequate facilities, failures of busing and desegregation plans, urban decay, the lack of accountability, the loss of faith in education and the middle class flight to the suburbs get the headlines and lead some to despair of the possibility that significant improvements may be effected.

These and other developments are symptoms of a dangerous crisis. Yet amid the prevailing gloom there are a variety of plans, ideas and operational patterns which hold considerable hope for a better, more productive future. *There are ways out of the crisis if we have the insights needed and the will to use them.*

Some Important Trends and Developments

Large cities are a comparatively recent phenomenon in American experience. The great increase in the size of American cities came in the first four decades of this century. Most generalizations about cities are difficult. There are both old and new cities. They differ greatly from North to South, and from the highly industrialized cities of the Northeast to those that are more agriculturally oriented in the Middlewest. They differ in the fact that some are still growing while others are losing population at a rapid rate.

No one approach could even begin to alleviate all the problems of these cities. But there are many hopeful developments which offer bits

*Prepared by *John W. Polley*, Assistant Commissioner for Educational Finance and Management Services, The State Education Department of New York, and *Robert E. Lamitie*, Executive Secretary, Western New York School Development Council.

and pieces of solutions. There are regional governance plans which allocate functions, funding and various aspects of planning to the level or unit at which each can be best performed. Many changes in school finance are now upon us. There are also many new developments in school housing, ranging from multi-purpose skyscrapers in areas of high density to the carefully planned and articulated school housing in the "new towns." Moreover, there are plans for accountability which are operational as well as others still formative; some call for the use of new technologies, while others depend on a vital but often neglected people-connectedness.

At the federal level a variety of new commitments and proposals have been made. The President has promised that the federal government will come up with proposals to relieve the property tax through revenue sharing or other plans which will probably require state tax reform. The recognition of the need for reform of the fiscal provisions for education becomes more widespread daily.

The primary focus of many proposals for reform is the core city. Court case after court case has directed that changes be made to redress the balance in the provision of resources between city and suburbs. The *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders,* better known as the Kerner Commission, has documented the deteriorating conditions in the central cities and urged new broad programs in education, housing and welfare. The Health, Education, and Welfare Urban Educational Task Force has provided massive evidence of the need for increased financing for urban schools and has recommended both revenue reforms and apportionment improvements which would provide massive relief to core cities.

Commission after commission has recommended new methods of financing education in various states. Education commissioners, legislatures and governors are beginning to recognize the problems of the cities and to seek advice on how to deal with them. Two outstanding recent commissions (the School Finance and Educational Opportunity Commission in Michigan, and the Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Education in New York State) have recommended a system of full state financing of education in order to overcome the problems created by the "haves"–chiefly in the suburbs–and the "have-nots"–primarily the central cities.

A statement by the National Educational Finance Project deals with the origin of some of the educational problems of the cities:

> . . . much historical evidence . . . indicates that the present plight of the central cities was created in considerable part by the failure of the states and the federal government to equalize educational opportunity among and within the states. Historically, the southern states, primarily because of the poverty relative to the rest of the nation, have had far more limited educational opportunities than other regions of the nation. This has been particularly true in the rural districts. There have been major improvements in educational programs in the southern states in recent years, but the disadvantaged migrants

*Footnote references are given at end of the chapter.

> from the southern states who are creating many of the problems of the core cities of the north were produced, and are still being produced, in rural areas with inadequate educational programs. Sound public policy surely indicates that adequate educational opportunities be made available in school districts of all population classifications, in all regions of the nation.[1]*

It is clear that the major problems are now recognized and that carefully formulated proposals for reform are being put forward. It is with such proposals and their implementation that this chapter is primarily concerned.

Proposals for reform need thorough planning. Changes in financing or structure must be based on the current needs and objectives of education—needs and objectives which have been changing as society itself has changed. But it is not enough that these reforms be developed by a blue ribbon commission; they must also be understood, accepted and supported by the people they affect. It is the responsibility of the state education agency to see that the process of study, discussion and decision is continuously in operation.

Proposals for reform depend on political action. Their enactment, or the lack of it, depends on votes which follow popular pressure. The reapportionment of state legislatures in response to the 1970 census and the "one man, one vote" Supreme Court decision do not augur well immediately for the central cities. The rapidly growing suburbs will gain legislative representation at the expense of central cities and rural areas. Without court intervention, it would appear that this trend is likely to buttress the already existing and well documented advantages of the existing educational finance provisions for many suburban school systems.

Also, the problems which most acutely affect the inner city have spread rapidly to the mature communities which form the first ring around the older cities. Disadvantaged children are now found in large numbers in many of the older suburbs. The problems of finding political support for an educational finance system to deal with these problems will not much longer remain primarily the burden of the central city residents.

1970 census figures for New York City and its metropolitan area support this contention. As reported in the *New York Times* for December 30, 1971, the overall increase in the city's nonwhite population in the sixties was 702,903 while the net migration of whites—the middle class exodus—was 955,519. But in the close-in counties, Westchester had a slight in-migration of whites, and Nassau, a slight loss. Hudson, Essex and Union counties in New Jersey had a net out-migration of whites.

The matter of providing meaningful amounts of federal aid for education has been debated in Congress for decades without substantial progress. There is one exception to the above statement—ESEA Title I has overwhelmingly provided aid to the central cities. In New York City, for example, this aid has amounted to an average of almost $150 per pupil enrolled, although it is targeted on the disadvantaged. It is likely that this type of aid will increase. Representatives at the federal level—especially in the Senate—are more dependent on big city votes than are most state legis-

lators. The strain of meeting needs at the state and local level has exhausted present revenue resources of many cities and states. A rescue job by Congress with federal funds and many other reforms is long overdue. Meaningful federal funds, carefully integrated with state and local support, can help to provide solutions to the many crises—in education as well as in other aspects of society—facing many states and cities.

Regionalism and Decentralization

There are two sides to the coin of consolidation or reorganization of school districts. There is great concern currently with how best to bring it about. Metropolitanism and regionalization constitute important approaches to the solution of some of the current problems. Equally important is the other side of the coin: how to bring about decentralization in those great cities where consolidation and centralization have been carried too far. Whichever is dealt with, federation, in the sense of a delegation of specified powers by a number of constituent units to a central body, is the approach usually proposed. The federation approach, rather than asking whether centralization or decentralization is required, deals with the question of what powers and duties can best be carried out at which governmental level.

Fiscal problems are close to the heart of the recent metropolitanism movement in education for two basic reasons. First, highly fragmented units for taxing and administering schools within a metropolitan area lead to serious—indeed indefensible—inequities both to taxpayers and to students. School tax burdens vary greatly within most metropolitan areas, yet expenditure levels tend to reflect community wealth much more than the level of services provided; often the highest tax rates are found in poor school districts with low levels of expenditure and vice versa. Wide variations in the scope, quality, and expenditure levels of school programs available from district to district *make equal opportunity a slogan* but obviously not a reality. Metropolitan or regional fiscal structures can mitigate or equalize both forms of inequity.

Unnecessary overlapping and duplication, inefficient small school districts, and failure to take advantage of economies of scale are causes of unnecessary added costs. Metropolitan administration or cooperation could and should bring about substantial economies.

Regionalism and metropolitanism are in many respects the same thing. However, the term "regionalism" suggests a state-wide approach aimed at the total educational problem—a third level of educational governance. "Metropolitanism" tends to suggest a more limited approach, both geographically and educationally.

The issue of decentralization of public schools has resulted in much discussion, heated controversy and has generated tremendous enthusiasm. That the matter should be controversial is perhaps surprising. Consolidation in city after city has brought large populations under one organizational structure but, outside of the city, lesser populations—but often

equally dense—are served by dozens of different school systems who treasure highly their "local control" of education. Nassau County, contiguous to New York City, contains fifty-six separate and independent school systems, while New York City, made up of five counties, was until recently one system.

There are many problems to be solved in both regionalism and decentralization, including the methods of selection and allocation of powers of both local and regional boards and the provision of adequate local board power over curriculum, local personnel, and other closely related matters. Perhaps most important of all, if regionalism and decentralization are to be successful, are the issues of financing and budgeting. In general, *the guiding principle is to allow a maximum of control over, and responsibility for, expenditures at the local or building level* while using the central or regional level for revenue raising and perhaps certain special services.

The Metropolitan Toronto School Board

Metropolitan Toronto (Canada) clearly illustrates one way to overcome the fiscal problems of a fragmented metropolitan area through federation. In the early fifties there were serious tax and expenditure inequities among school districts in that area that were similar to those of the cities of our Northeast and Middlewest. There was a "state aid" plan through the Province of Ontario that helped to mitigate—but which far from overcame—these inequities, much as is done in a typical state aid program in this country.

In 1953, the Provincial Parliament established a metropolitan school board whose members are elected by the respective local school boards who, in turn, are elected by their respective citizens. The Metropolitan Toronto (metro) School Board was granted certain initial powers and duties and was chartered to assume such other powers and duties as might be assigned to it from time to time by the local boards.

Chief among the powers of the metro board was to levy a metropolitan school tax on property which, when supplemented by provincial aid, was used to pay the costs of providing the basic programs in all the school districts. Each board was free to levy additional taxes to provide additional services at local option. Initially the metro tax raised fifty to sixty percent of operating costs and all capital costs.

Chief among the powers of the Metropolitan School Board were:

- To levy a metropolitan school tax and allocate its receipts to the local boards;
- To assume the debts that the local school districts had previously incurred for building schools; and
- To finance construction of new schools up to a fixed cost ceiling with local boards responsible for costs, if any, above the ceiling.

The local boards continued to have the power to establish their own

policies, to hire and fire personnel, and to exercise all other powers not delegated to the metro board.

In the years since the Metropolitan Toronto School Board was established it has continued largely as an instrumentality for financing schools, leaving operation to the local boards. Its staff has remained small. However, the local boards have delegated additional powers to it including:

- Negotiation and establishment of a uniform metropolitan teachers salary schedule;
- Operation of special schools for the seriously retarded; and
- Financing an increasing share, *now nearly the total,* of school operating costs.

Metropolitan Toronto provides an excellent example that should be considered by other metropolitan areas concerned with overcoming their problems of tax and expenditure inequities, while continuing to operate their schools under locally elected school boards.

Metropolitan Equalization Authorities

Several years ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in Washington drafted a model bill that could be adapted by the states to establish Metropolitan Education Equalization Authorities.[2] As envisioned in the bill, such Authorities would serve only to raise taxes and to distribute revenues on the basis of educational need. All present powers of local boards would be maintained, including the right to levy local taxes to provide additional support for their local school programs. Such Authorities could provide substantial tax and expenditure equalization, both to cities and the poorer suburbs.

City Expansion and Desegregation

One of the simplest methods cities could utilize to solve some of their problems would be to extend their boundaries. In most states, any such extension would now require approval of the voters in the area to be annexed. When cities could provide more and better services, an affirmative vote was relatively easy to obtain. Now, however, it is seldom that such consent can be obtained. Indeed, the very suggestion is likely to arouse strong opposition.

There have recently been two court cases, however, where a form of metropolitan school district has been sought as a judicial remedy to the problem of segregation. The two cities involved are Detroit, Michigan, and Richmond, Virginia. The Detroit case offered for consideration two main issues: (1) segregation, and (2) discrimination on the basis of wealth.

In the Detroit case (Bradley v. Milliken), having found a segregated public school system in Detroit, the judge ruled to add as parties defendant several Michigan school districts located in adjacent Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland counties, on the principal premise or ground that effective

relief could not be achieved or ordered in their absence. A somewhat similar situation exists in the Richmond area, where the court ordered consolidation with two suburban county school districts. Such cases could have important implications for other cities, and, if upheld, a profound effect on educational quality and equality.

Some comments from the November 14, 1971, issue of the *New York Times* illustrate the complexity of the problem of segregation, in this instance in regard to busing:

> There is growing opinion that unless the Supreme Court expresses itself in the Northern, big city context—which it has never done—to define the limits of busing, the political tides may overcome the painfully wrought gains in desegregation in the South and elsewhere. Because school districts vary in geography and racial mix while justice should remain constant, this presents a dilemma of the toughest kind . . . Some . . . believe the schools alone cannot bear the burden of achieving racial justice, that the ultimate answer lies in opening the suburbs to all.

It is increasingly apparent that the schools alone cannot bear the burden of providing a successful educational program. The total environment conditions educational success. Health care, housing, hunger, total parental input and scores of other factors have their effects on the success of what occurs within the schools. The states have an obligation to help to resolve these difficult and complex problems.

New York City Decentralization

The school year 1970-71 was the first full year of operation for the New York's decentralized districts. State law requires that:

> Community School Districts shall receive a total annual allocation of operating funds, determined by an objective and equitable formula, which they shall be permitted to use with the widest possible discretion within educational standards and goals and union contract obligations.

The funds allocated for the operation of community school districts are based on a complex formula, using the actual number of children registered and actual salaries paid for the staff required. Adjustments are made for administrative costs, for continuing services, for the substitutes required for leaves, for staffing for new schools and a variety of other factors. Significantly, the allocation for administration may be used for instruction but not the reverse. Title I, ESEA funds and New York State Urban Education funds are in addition to the above and are available to target areas based upon approved projects.

The boards have power, subject to the provisions of collective-bargaining agreements, over the selection and assignment of personnel in the elementary, intermediate and junior high schools within their boundaries. High schools remain under the control of the central board of education.

The boards also have power—within the limits of contractual obligations entered into by the central board—over the allocation of virtually all funds spent on the schools under their jurisdiction. The enrollment in each district is 25,000 to 30,000 pupils.

Perhaps most significant is that the thirty-one boards of education

and scores of community groups in each of these New York City districts will come to have an increased understanding of how their schools operate and the elected officials in each district will have an important role in the process.

Regionalism in Financing

Regionalism in school finance is a much discussed concept which has never had any real demonstration in this country. County systems are common in the Southern and a few other states, but a true regionalism would encompass a much larger area. Indeed, if it does not, it is likely to leave a wide disparity in local resources which can only be partly alleviated by massive amounts of state financing or full state funding.

Regionalism offers a means of eliminating the large differences in provision of funds for education among cities, suburbs and rural communities. It offers a base which can support a wide range of educational services, and perhaps an opportunity to tap a new revenue source, the income tax—definitely a more elastic and a more equitable source than the property tax. And as has been suggested in the review of the court cases affecting urban education, the metropolitan regional district offers the most likely and most logical means of easing the desperate segregation problems of the inner city and the increasing segregation problems of the older, first-ring suburbs.

Several state studies have recommended the regional approach as a means of lessening fiscal disparities. In Rhode Island, a 1968 study[3] suggested dividing the state into four regions each representing ". . . in miniature the composition of the pupil population of the state as a whole."

The New York State Education Department studied the actual fiscal effects of regional financing in one section of the state. The study looked at both a limited form of regional finance, covering only the cost of debt service and transportation, and a regional financing program covering all the costs of education. The conclusion was reached that the full regional financing would be more equitable. The study found:

> . . . the wide disparity in local tax rates could be reduced with almost all but the wealthiest districts having lower tax rates than previously. The benefits in opportunities for improved local programs and innovations in regional programs should prove to be substantial.[4]

Regional financing of education lends itself to solving the troublesome problem of cost differentials between the metropolitan areas and the rural areas. On a district-by-district basis, cost data are erratic and unreliable. On a regional basis, it is possible to measure cost differentials quite readily either through spending for current purposes or through the differences in the salaries paid.

Better Facilities for Urban Schools

The stress of providing funds for facilities (which in most states is still considered primarily a local responsibility), the implications of pro-

grams of desegregation and the increasing emphasis on planning for an integrated approach to all aspects of community living are leading to important new approaches to the provision of space for learning. Such approaches range from those designed primarily to ease fiscal constraints to those which are aimed at an integrated approach to the planning of all aspects of the community.

Construction Authorities

In a number of states provisions have been established to make it possible for the capital costs of school buildings to be met by a public benefit corporation or authority which can issue bonds for the purpose of purchasing and constructing school buildings that are leased to a school district, often on a lease-purchase arrangement.

A major impetus for the adoption of laws permitting such arrangements comes from existing tax, debt, or interest rate limitations which can be circumvented in this manner. Of course, a more direct and defensible solution to many of these problems would be to eliminate or modify such local limitations or, in most cases, to establish regional or state systems for financing capital outlay.

However, some benefits, in addition to overcoming these limitations, may be obtained from such arrangements if the appropriate powers are granted. More efficient use can be made of valuable land through the construction of buildings to be jointly used by various agencies for a variety of purposes—for example, commercial office space, school facilities and housing—all in the same building. Better comprehensive planning can bring greater accomplishment of socially desirable goals involving all agencies in the community rather than merely schools. Greater tax or "tax equivalency" payments can be made available through the leasing of joint occupancy facilities or the sale or lease of air rights over railroads, highways, or authority owned sites; or through condominium ownership agreements.

Better still, under arrangements such as one possible through the New York City Educational Construction Fund, established by law in 1966, school facilities can be provided at virtually no cost to the city other than the cost of the land. This law established a public benefit corporation, the majority of whose trustees are members of the New York City Board of Education. This corporation has the authority to finance, construct, and lease sites and facilities for combined occupancy by schools, housing, offices or other appropriate purposes.

The city provides land to the Fund authorities in return for their agreement to provide school facilities meeting Board of Education specifications. The Fund arranges for the construction of combined occupancy facilities whose private leaseholders make tax equivalency payments to the Fund that are equal to the real estate taxes that would normally be due the city. The payments fully offset the construction cost of a school building except in cases where the housing portion of the facilities requires tax abatement under state and federal low- and moderate-income

housing programs. In these cases a deficit results which may be covered either by surplus revenues available to the Fund from other projects, or by direct payments from the city. In such cases, the construction cost to the city is less than normal and a socially desirable result—the low income housing—has been obtained.

Multi-Purpose Facilities and New Towns

Multi-purpose facilities can also be provided without the establishment of new corporations or authorities, if suitable funding arrangements can be made.

The Human Resources Center in Pontiac, Michigan, is an outstanding example of the use of a single building complex to house an integrated combination of community service facilities.[5] In addition to an elementary school, the complex includes facilities for community health, welfare, family counseling, recreation, adult education and cultural services. It also includes restaurants.

The school district built and owns the facilities, the financing of which was assisted by a grant from the Neighborhood Facilities Program of the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. A public vote in 1968 supported the necessary funds for construction and operation of the school facilities. The federal grant paid for the cost of the other components which the school district can lease to the other users. This project involved close and extensive cooperation among numerous city and county departments, local urban planners, the Community Action Organization and other agencies.

One of the interesting new developments in the provision of education in cities is the "New Town" movement. Apparently the most successful in the United States, thus far, is Columbia, Maryland. Many more such communities are now on the drawing board. According to the planners, *learning is the foundation of the community*. In physical terms this means the schools.

Elementary facilities are provided for each neighborhood together with the other necessary community facilities, such as a day care center, meeting rooms, a swimming pool, park and playground. The plans call for dual-purpose use.

The secondary schools are located near shopping centers with easy access to the public library, village meeting halls and park and playground facilities. The junior and senior high schools are near each other so facilities can be shared. The planning groups have also emphasized the need for smaller secondary schools—with an enrollment of about 1,000 students—in order to afford more opportunity for participation in the affairs of each school.

Education is obviously the key factor in any new town which is designed to provide optimal living conditions. Furthermore it is a key factor in attracting desirable industry. But most, or perhaps all, of the new towns will have a relatively small amount of low income housing unless federal

subsidies of considerable magnitude are provided. Under present finance laws, the lack of low income housing would lead to a privileged school district.

Another problem involves the issue as to how to upgrade the quality of education in existing areas to meet the needs of the new towns. At Columbia, careful plans were developed in an effort to bring this about. Planning money was provided from foundations in order that open schools might be planned and developed. The curriculum was also restructured, and the county organization was altered.

Dozens of new towns are now being planned. Most of them will be cities having up to 100,000 population—the size encouraged by the Urban Growth and New Community Development Act of 1970. The significance for the provision of school facilities is the probable multi-purpose use, the integrated planning of building in relation to the total community, and the fact that the structures are likely to be built—often at less cost—by private developers and leased to the school district, thereby changing significantly the pattern of capital financing.

The creation of shared multi-purpose facilities, whether in new towns or through other new legal or financial arrangements, is one of the newer developments which offers much hope in the seventies for economy, for better community planning, and for more flexible educational arrangements.

Educational Parks

There has been a definite trend toward larger schools in the cities for at least three generations. The chief reasons for this trend have been the broadened and improved educational offerings made possible and the economies of scale made available. Moreover, hundreds of rural and suburban school districts have consolidated all their facilities onto single sites in order to achieve these benefits for enrollments up to a few thousand pupils.

In recent years, proposals have been made to expand this principle so as to achieve still greater benefits and serve still greater numbers through the establishment of educational parks.[6] Such parks, in addition to having the advantages of economy of scale, could provide other important benefits as well. These benefits apply not only to educational quality and cost, but also to the improvement of community life and development.

The effective implementation of the educational park concept requires that many fixed ideas be abandoned and many established practices and relationships be reordered. Such ideas must always overcome great barriers if they are to achieve acceptance.

While a few parks have been or are being constructed, the most imaginative and far reaching proposals have been languishing in the files of many great city school boards.[7] A variety of problems (for example, the initial cost, political opposition to integration, and legal problems) have prevented the full exploration of the potential of the idea. In the

face of these obstacles, the immediate prospects for testing the idea of the large urban or metropolitan educational park seemed rather dim until the approval by the U. S. Senate of its version of the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education Act of 1971, which would provide for grants for unusually promising projects or programs, and for the federal government "to pay all or part of the cost of planning and constructing integrated educational parks" in urban and metropolitan areas. If this bill is approved without major alterations, it may be possible for a small number of thoroughgoing explorations and tests of the full development of the potential of the concept of the educational park to be made.

Responsibilities of the States

The states have many important, and usually unmet, responsibilities relating to the provision of adequate educational facilities not only in the cities but also in other areas where learning is seriously handicapped because of inadequate or inappropriate facilities. These responsibilities include:

- Helping cities to determine the appropriateness of their purposes, and the advantages and disadvantages of the various alternatives including those discussed above;
- Encouraging and facilitating cooperative long-range planning for facilities and their financing by city and suburban governments, city and other local school governments in the metropolitan area, and by other appropriate agencies and groups, for the development of adequate facilities;
- Identifying and removing restrictive legislation that makes it difficult, or impossible, to accomplish what should be done; and
- Developing adequate and appropriate provisions for allotting, on an equitable basis, state and federal funds to meet a substantial part of the capital outlay and debt service costs of needed facilities for schools or for school and community purposes.

The Crisis in City School Finance

Most large core cities find themselves in a severe financial bind. Many services are provided in the cities which the suburbs typically do not provide or need to provide for themselves. Moreover, many city services must be provided to a greater degree than in the suburbs including, among others, welfare and police. Furthermore, almost everything in the cities costs more to provide. There is a greater proportion of the poor and the handicapped in the cities than in the suburbs. Land for buildings costs more. Militant teacher unions force pay schedules as high or higher than those in the wealthy suburbs. The flight to the suburbs weakens the financial base of the cities. Many tax producers, both businesses and people, move to the suburbs and are replaced by high tax consumers—migrants from rural or small town areas in search of better living conditions.

Wide disparities in per pupil expenditure for education exist between most central cities and their suburbs. New York City, despite a tripling of expenditures for education in the decade of the '60's, still spends less than its affluent suburbs. The figure currently is $1,400 per pupil, as contrasted with $1,700 to $1,800. In 1968-69, Los Angeles spent $636 per pupil, while Beverly Hills spent $1,131. Detroit spent $575, while Grosse Point spent $875.

Couple all this with the great dependence on an inelastic and regressive property tax base and state aid formulas which—whether they be for roads or for education—tend to be more favorable to the suburbs than to the others, and the elements of a crisis can be identified.

Evidence of crisis conditions can be found repeatedly. Philadelphia, in 1971-72, was $41 million short of meeting its budget of $365 million. It has cut positions and plans to shorten the school year by five weeks. New York City cut some 5,000 positions in order to limit budget increases. Portland, Oregon, anticipated a need to cut seventeen days from the school year in order to offset an expected budget deficit. And this condition is not confined to the largest cities. Independence, Missouri, Dayton, Ohio, and Kalamazoo, Michigan, have shortened the school year. According to the National Education Association, forty-one of the sixty-three largest school systems in the country are operating under crisis conditions in the school year 1971-72.

Despite all the evidence as to needs in the central cities it must be remembered that in many cases they are centers of industry and commerce. If real property values overstate their ability to support education, per capita income figures still indicate considerable ability. In a recent paper written at the University of Florida, Jack E. Fisher[8] compared ten core cities with their SMSA's on adjusted gross income per student. He found that on this measure the city was more wealthy than neighboring suburban counties with very few exceptions. Fisher was careful to point out that the raw per pupil measure does not state the complete educational need. His paper serves to underline the great diversity existing among cities and the complex nature of an equitable solution to the problem of an adequate fiscal program for funding education.

There is another ameliorating factor in considering the fiscal problems of the cities. Title I of ESEA has provided funds which have largely gone to the cities. In New York State, New York City receives over 75% of the Title I allocation for the State and its impact is heavy. Chicago gets 56% of Illinois' Title I funds, while Baltimore gets 55% of Maryland's. Berke makes this statement concerning the fiscal effects of Title I:

> But when one disaggregates the various Federal programs a surprising fact emerges. Title I of ESEA of 1965, providing $1.5 billion for the education of the disadvantaged, appears to be an immense financial success. Proportionately higher levels of Title I funds go to school systems with 1) lower income levels, 2) higher proportions of non-whites, 3) central city or rural location, and 4) greater educational need as measured by lower mean achievement scores. Put simply, then, despite the many criticisms that have been leveled at it, Title I gets money to places where the fiscal crisis is greatest.[9]

Despite the fact that, overall, Title I of ESEA provides a small proportion of the funds for education, its impact in the cities is considerable.

State Aid Formulas

The aid formulas in operation in most states resulted from efforts in the 1920's when the Strayer-Haig-Mort formulas evolved. The basic purpose was equalization of financial provisions for a *minimum* program. Underlying this development was the necessity to bring rural education up to something resembling the standards in the leading systems—the cities. Suburban living was then just coming into being.

The formulas included several features which do not fit conditions today. For example, all districts have to exceed the *minimum program* for which funds are made available by the state. The most able districts can do this with ease, normally raising six, eight or even ten or more times as many local dollars per pupil with the same tax rate as the poorer districts. The minimum state grants mean that equalization works reasonably well only for a portion of the districts. The more able districts actually get extra aid in proportion to their ability.

Berke states the problem for the cities as follows:

> . . . for large city and other high density districts, equalization has failed because state aid schemes typically use measures of community wealth and educational need that are insensitive to the problems of intense urbanization. The results, therefore, are predictable; state aid formulas regularly provide proportionately less aid to urban areas than they do to suburban and rural areas.[10]

The Measurement of Educational Need

The state aid formulas typically do something to equalize differences in ability as measured by property valuation but they rarely measure the pupil need for educational service except in a rough and primitive way. A basic problem for the great cities has been to secure adequate recognition in aid formulas of the extra costs of the education of the economically disadvantaged, the handicapped and those in vocational programs.

New variations continue to arise as social conditions affecting the provision of education change. It is apparent that the problem of the distribution of funds may never be resolved to everyone's satisfaction. There probably will always be wide disagreements about the tasks to be performed. For example, should greater emphasis be placed on the education of children with learning disabilities resulting from societal neglect or should the emphasis be on the education of the talented? Although it is unlikely that the need for education by a given individual will ever be measured precisely, present knowledge should enable differentiation among broad groups of students.

A number of specific suggestions have been made for changing the unit of need. One is to substitute a per capita for a per pupil grant. The basic difficulty with this proposal is that the educational system is not presently concerned with the total population of the community but only with children of elementary and secondary school age. Higher education

is financed separately. Moreover, children of elementary and secondary school age are much more highly concentrated in certain communities than in others. Normally the suburbs have a higher proportion of public elementary and secondary school students than do other types of districts. Non-public school membership varies tremendously from community to community.

It has been suggested that the use of membership, rather than attendance, would improve the measure. This argument is based on the fact that those communities which have the most children that are difficult to educate—normally the big cities—have both the highest rates of absenteeism and the highest drop out rates.

Still another suggestion is that the need measure can be improved by giving a weighting for certain groups of children, such as the disadvantaged, those in occupational education, and those who are educationally handicapped. In essence this is already done, at least to a degree, through Title I of ESEA and through state programs that provide special funds for urban areas. The use of an appropriate weighting might tend to change the categorical nature of the present special programs for the disadvantaged in general-aid programs, but this would not necessarily happen. Furthermore, whatever the system of weightings, it would be important to insure that duplication is avoided. For example, an economically disadvantaged student may also enroll in an occupational course.

One suggestion designed to insure more equitable distribution of funds within cities is to require financial accounting on a building-by-building basis. This will help to ensure that aid funds would find their way to the types of students for whom they are intended.

By far the most extensive attempt to document and measure cost differentials among various target groups served by the public schools was undertaken by the National Educational Finance Project[11] through a series of satellite studies. Despite difficulties with adequate and consistent data from state to state, the evidence is overwhelming that costs vary tremendously among distinct programs offered by the public schools and that the target groups requiring these programs have far different incidences among school districts.

Municipal Overburden and the Measurement of Ability

Another widely advocated proposal for adjusting state aid formulas to deal with the fiscal problems of the core cities is that an adjustment be made for municipal overburden. This concept, which was developed in 1961 in a series of studies directed by Mort,[12] recognizes a nearly universal condition of the cities of the United States: that as cities grow, the per capita cost of government increases rapidly. Furthermore, a large proportion of city resources is required by the numerous and ever expanding municipal services as compared with school district services.

Ability to support education, as used in state aid formulas, is usually measured by dividing the total true property value of the district by av-

erage daily attendance or membership. Some authorities insist that the resulting figure overstates the city school district's ability, and that city districts cannot tax as large a portion of the base as is normal throughout the state because the many municipal services needed require the funds raised from the larger portion of the tax base. They point out that overstated ability results in less state aid than that to which the city would be entitled if the disribution formula recognized this unique circumstance of overburden borne by the largest communities.

The concept has considerable appeal. It has, however, many weaknesses. For example, it calls for increased state aid for education by virtue of heavy local expenditures for services other than education. If the formula for computing municipal overburden is not carefully drawn in terms other than proportions of expenditure, it can easily be manipulated to produce more funds without any resulting educational benefits. Moreover, it ignores the phenomenon of proportionately large public school populations in low income, rapidly developing suburbs which requires that a larger proportion of total municipal expenditures be utilized for education in those places.

Furthermore, it provides for further tinkering with the state aid formula while ignoring a basic problem underlying fiscal inequities: district organizational structure and the dependence of school districts on the yield of the local property tax. It ignores the fact that the correction made by picking up more of the cost of education in places with the greatest municipal overburden increases aid for education, while the more obvious and more equitable solution—that is, more aid for those municipal services which cause the overburden in the first place—is overlooked.

Full state funding, already utilized in Hawaii and recommended in Michigan and New York, would, of course, obviate the need for formulas using measures of ability and thereby the need for tinkering with those measures. But it could result in other kinds of problems and complexities that may not easily be resolved.[13]

The Property Tax

The overuse of the property tax for the support of education is another cause of difficulty in present formulas. Not only is the tax heavily used, but it is made available for the support of education on a district, rather than on a metropolitan or state-wide, basis. The amounts and value of property, and hence the revenues raised from the tax, vary tremendously from district to district. The first shortcoming has given rise to a chorus calling for relief, the second to a series of court cases in which heavy reliance on the use of the property taxes levied by districts which vary greatly in wealth, has been declared unconstitutional.

The heavy pressure for increased revenue at the local level has put such a strain on the property tax that there is an almost universal demand for property tax relief. From 1948 to 1968, property tax revenues increased from $6.126 billion to $27.747 billion, a 350 percent increase. A $21.6 billion increase out of a total increase in state and local revenues

of $47 billion in the same period indicates how much dependence has been placed on this tax.

Because of the nature of the property tax, an overdependence on it has especially deleterious effects in the core cities. The tax is regressive and hence bears heavily on the core city poor. Since it is levied on both land and improvements, it discourages the rebuilding of decaying sections of the cities where land costs are high and encourages "urban sprawl" as a result of the search for cheaper land and perhaps lower taxes. It encourages owners to let property deteriorate, since improvements to property result in greater taxes.

Property tax relief may take a variety of forms. It has already taken the form of increased use of the income tax, a much more elastic and equitable source of revenue, at both the state and the city level—a trend which will continue. It has also taken the lead or contributed to the assumption—or demands for assumption—of certain services at both the state and the federal levels. The demands for federal assumption of welfare costs and for full state funding of education indicate future trends. There is also an increasing demand for some appropriate kind of federal revenue sharing. The elasticity of federal revenue sources, as contrasted with the virtual exhaustion of current revenue sources in many states, makes some kind of revenue sharing not only a hope for the improvement of state and local services but, in many states, almost the only hope for maintaining them at the present level.

Revenue Sharing

There has been a spate of revenue sharing proposals recently. Most notable among them are the Administration's plan and the plan proposed by Representative Wilbur Mills. Both provide for channeling funds directly to cities as well as to state governments.

Revenue sharing would appear to be most beneficial to those highly industralized, highly urbanized states which now make a vigorous tax effort. In such states, any further increase in taxes is likely to drive out industry and individuals who pay higher income taxes. At the same time, these states attract persons in low income groups from some other states because of the higher level of social services provided. These persons usually find their way into the ghettos of the large cities. An appropriate plan for revenue sharing should provide tax relief at the state level and encourage state tax reform to more nearly equalize competitive tax conditions among the states. It should also provide needed tax relief for the cities.

There are other arguments for revenue sharing. It would eliminate the present matching requirements and narrow purposes of categorical grants and the mountainous accompanying paper work, since these grants would be absorbed into the new revenue sharing funds. It would place more funds closer to the problems at the state and local levels and hence to the people.

There are cautions about revenue sharing which must be borne in mind if it is to benefit those cities which are now experiencing the worst fiscal crises. There must be a state or state-federal plan for channeling money to cities on the basis of their special needs. Moreover, unless safeguards are provided, revenue sharing might well result in some shifting of funds away from educational programs for the disadvantaged or from other specifically earmarked federal aid categories. It must be remembered that many federal programs are aimed at encouraging the provision of services that might not otherwise exist. Title I, ESEA, is an excellent case in point. Is it realistic to expect that such needs would no longer arise if revenue sharing is adopted?

Since state and local needs are growing annually at $15 billion per year, neither plan would eliminate the need for more taxes, but the relief provided would be useful and tax reform encouraged, and should serve to increase state taxing capacity.

Recent Court Cases

The recent series of court cases has tremendous implications for the financing of education and the local use of property tax. Since still other cases are pending and since all of these are still *state* court cases, the outcomes are uncertain until an appeal or several appeals have reached the Supreme Court and have been decided.

Very briefly in the Illinois case—McGinnis v. Oglie—the court concluded that the equal protection requirement of the Fourteenth Amendment does not require that school expenditures be based only on educational need, and that the lack of judically manageable standards made the controversy nonjusticiable.

In Serrano v. Priest—the California case—the court found the public school finance system to be unconstitutional under both the Fourteenth Amendment and the California Constitution. The reasoning behind this decision is that the present method of raising revenue based largely on property taxes levied by school districts denies equal protection to citizens of poorer districts since they must levy higher taxes to provide the same or a lesser education as that provided in wealthy districts. The question of defining equality was left to the California Legislature and, presumably, another definition or arrangement would be subject to another court test.

In Van Duartz v. Hatfield—the Minnesota case—the determination was was much the same as in the Serrano case; that the level of spending for a child's education may not be a function of wealth other than the wealth of the state as a whole. The court retained jurisdiction until after the current legislative session. Minnesota has now increased state funding substantially but has still left considerable advantage with wealthy districts.

In Rodriguez v. Edgar—the Texas case—the courts have again found a denial of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment and have ruled that the legislature must develop a remedy.

Possible Future Action

Because of the court cases, present demonstrable inequalities, and a desire and need for moving away from heavy reliance on the property tax base, a series of new plans for financing education is likely to be advanced.

Full, or greatly increased, state funding is high on that list. If the state takes over the entire cost of education, district fiscal inequalities will be wiped out. Other inequalities will remain, however. Presumably dependence on the property tax will be lessened, but this will only be so if the state can raise funds from other revenue sources. If the property tax remains the main source of revenue, large cities in particular may find themselves paying more property taxes because of the great amounts of property in those districts and because full state funding would probably require an equal application of the tax across the state (that is, use of a state property tax for support of schools). Differences in need must be recognized if cities are to improve their lot—and these murky waters may well give rise to more litigation. The question of whether to permit local districts to raise and spend amounts above the state funded level must be settled. With such local add-ons there are bound to be inequalities; without them there may be a wholesale exodus from the public schools in what have been leading suburban school systems unless the state can maintain a high level of support.

Full state funding has two major thrusts. One is the equalization of educational opportunity. The wide discrepancies among districts in spending for education would be lessened and made to conform more nearly to educational need.

The other major thrust of full state funding is the equalizing of the property tax burden and, hopefully, concurrently, the reduction of the reliance on the local property tax base. By levying a statewide property tax at a uniform state rate the burdens of the tax will be spread more equally.

Despite the handicaps of reliance on district structure and the current heavy dependence on the property tax, many attempts at reform are almost certain to involve increased state and federal funding with revisions and corrections in present type formulas. How the great cities, with their concentrations of disadvantaged, would fare under such plans will depend to a far greater degree than at present on how fully the added needs associated with the required extra cost programs are recognized than on what revenue raising system is adopted.

Accountability

Accountability may be defined as the responsibility to justify the use of resources in terms of their contribution to the accomplishment of desired results. But this term has lost some precision in recent years. Everyone is in favor of accountability—although there may be nearly as many definitions of it as there are people in any group discussing it. Most defi-

nitions can be placed on a continuum between, at one extreme, an emphasis on sophisticated and complicated schemes for measurement of output and cost-effectiveness and, at the other, emphasis on governance and control structures whereby citizens and parents feel themselves in a practical position to "call to account" those who educate their children.

For a discussion of accountability to be fruitful, it is important to distinguish between the two extremes of emphasis. Both are useful and both have common characteristics but each calls for a different set of activities and attitudes. We will refer to the two as the *community control* approach and the *management technology* approach to accountability.

The Community Control Approach

In the big cities, the cry for accountability is a result both of the public mood of dissatisfaction with the results attained and of the feeling of relative powerlessness to improve them. Hence, both approaches have relevance. It is probably safe to generalize, however, that the problem is less likely to be solved in the big cities by sophisticated techniques of measurement, evaluation, and management technology—useful as they may turn out to be—than by ways of involving the full spectrum of interested citizens in the redesign of their educational programs and in giving those citizens practical powers and responsibilities for bringing about change.

For this reason we can look with hope to the decentralization programs under way in New York City, discussed earlier, and to those that are being considered elsewhere, as a major and important accountability strategy.

Another practice relating to the community control strategy for accountability is the requirement that Community Action Organizations be consulted in such programs as those authorized under Title I of the ESEA. In this and similar cases, Congress has taken a step in the direction of the community control approach.

Voucher plans, such as those promoted by the Office of Economic Opportunity, also exemplify this approach. Those who support such plans tend to believe (perhaps naively) that students and their parents will know when programs are succeeding. They tend to have more confidence in the efficacy of this informal but highly personalized evaluation than in more "scientific" assessment programs. Despite all of its difficulties, the voucher plan is seen by some as a step beyond "community" control toward individual control of each child's program.

In many large cities, increasing use is being made of parent advisory committees, of parents and students on curriculum committees, of wide participation in planning charettes, of policy advisory boards for individual schools, and of various other devices intended to make the schools more responsive to their immediate clientele. All these mechanisms reflect steps in the direction indicated by the community control approach. They are especially useful when *real* powers are granted to such groups—for

example, the power of a school advisory board to have a voice in the selection and retention of the principal.

The Management Technology Approach

A number of projects and programs throughout the nation reflect the management technology approach to accountability. At the state level the program in Florida is a good exemplar.

In Florida, legislation enacted in 1970 required the state board of education to present to the legislature a "Plan for Educational Assessment in Florida." This plan was presented in March 1971 and is now in its initial stages of implementation.[14]

The plan calls for the development of the assessment model in three phases. The first phase, *Product Assessment,* will relate to establishing procedures for developing and maintaining statements of desired outcomes and for monitoring actual outcomes so as to identify discrepancies between what is and what is desired. Criterion referenced tests are under development to be applied in the schools of the state through a matrix sampling technique. Reading is a focus of initial emphasis in this phase, but vocational education is also under study.

The second phase is *Cost Analysis* or *Input Assessment.* Here new cost breakdowns are indentified and developed so they will be useful in the third phase, *Process Assessment,* through which "broad process areas relating to the larger product discrepancies will be identified and where alternative processes will be developed and tested. . . . As new processes are installed, the specific effects of those processes on student outputs and upon input allocation will be available for management decisions related to efficacy, efficiency and cost-effectiveness."

The Florida approach and others like it, including various Planning-Programming-Budgeting System or Educational Resource Management System plans under development, generally call for considerable developmental work. Meanwhile such steps as interpreting and making available to the public information on drop-out rates, progress, problems, and achievement of students would represent a step forward in many cities.

A Middle Ground Approach

A third approach to accountability, closely related but nevertheless not the same as the two described above, uses broad based local planning as its key strategy. It includes wide public participation and provides continuous public information concerning results, but it tends to take a more pragmatic and flexible approach to goal setting than the theoretical attempt to define all objectives with considerable precision, on which so many of the management technology oriented plans seem to founder. Its emphasis is on curriculum needs assessment, goal setting, planning, evaluation, and decision-making authority at the local rather than the state level.

The School System Redesign program in New York State is provid-

ing limited resources and support for about fifty school districts, including one of the new decentralized districts in New York City, to establish new procedures for greatly expanding citizen participation in programs to "redesign" their schools. The State Education Department, which initiated the program in 1970, and provides technical assistance on request, is emphasizing local autonomy in working with participating districts. It is attempting to be as flexible and open as the law permits it to be in allowing districts to use unorthodox methods and procedures. The only commitments required of districts to participate in the program are that they: (1) aggressively seek out and employ expanded participation on policy formulation and decision making; (2) try insofar as possible to take a holistic view and study and improve the school system as a whole though even their short-term goals may often be limited; and (3) provide evaluation methods and data as worked out in cooperation with the advisory groups. Participation is entirely voluntary.

Another example of this third approach, in which a more state-oriented strategy is utilized, is moving ahead in Florida concurrently with the development of the Educational Assessment plan described earlier. It is called the Florida Improvement Expense Program.[15] Under this program, begun in 1968, additional state aid amounting to about seventy dollars a pupil is available to each school board for "improving the quality of the educational program based on an approved plan . . . including a program for evaluation."

In order to obtain this aid the board must develop and file with the Florida Department of Education, in accordance with established criteria, an approved long-range comprehensive plan extending five years or more and show how it proposes to use the funds to improve its program.

A community task force of lay, student and professional persons must be involved in the development of the plan and "it is suggested that the district's legislative delegation be consulted and, as much as feasible, become involved in the planning." Guidelines have been developed by the state that suggest needs assessment data and procedures, programs for study and analysis, and set forth the legislative mandate that staff development be given priority. The long-range plans submitted to the Department of Education for approval must include sections on staff development, facilities, school management and organization, capital outlay, and transportation. A number of other possible areas of need are suggested; these must be set forth in terms of priorities established locally.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education has also developed and is implementing a plan to assist in assessment of the quality of education in the school districts of the Commonwealth.[16] Under this program, initiated in 1963, ten broad goals of education have been defined, inventories have been developed and tested and norms and technical analyses have been published. This program is now well developed and available to local schools.

Participation in this program is entirely voluntary. A school or school district may request testing of all its pupils at grade five or eleven

or both. The Department then provides instruments for use with all pupils at those grades, processes the instruments, provides reports on scores in all of the ten broad areas and sends staff members personally to consult with local educators on the interpretation of the findings. From then on, possible decisions related to the findings are completely in the hands of the local district, where wide participation is encouraged.

In great cities, the use of this middle ground approach necessarily involves, as in New York City, the use of decentralized units smaller than the city as a whole in order to obtain the full benefits of the wide planning and participation the approach requires. The individual school is one such unit.

Improving Local Planning – A Challenge to State Leadership

Leadership at the state level is a crucial factor in the encouragement and provision of this desirable middle ground approach to planning and accountability. Every state should develop an agency, as many already have, that is capable of providing continuous planning coordination among all appropriate state and local agencies that are concerned with education.

Every state should also provide resources, incentives and assistance to broad-based long-range local educational planning.[17] This assistance should include all phases of the planning process, from suggesting competent people or agencies who can be of assistance in setting up or initiating planning activities, to helping devise effective procedures for implementing plans, or to helping provide resources to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of changes that are made. As has been pointed out in an earlier volume in this series, it is important that such aid not be in the form of doing the planning or mandating it. Rather, the aid provided should be directed toward mobilizing all segments of each committee to enable it to reach an agreement on its own wishes and to take effective action toward making it a reality.[18]

Summary

As this country has become predominantly (in terms of population) an urbanized nation, every aspect of the problems of education in the urban areas offers an unprecedented challenge. One of the most immediate and urgent aspects of the challenge is that of financing programs and facilities and ensuring the necessary accountability. Much of the leadership in meeting this challenge must be provided by the states.

The overwhelming problem of adequate financial provisions after a decade of inflation has given rise to a panorama of unprecedented change. Metropolitanism, regionalism, full state financing, revenue sharing, and reform of property taxation as the chief support of education, are being widely discussed and proposed for legislative action. The most acute manifestation of the crisis is in the core city which, while still a center of affluence for some, is also a center of concentration of the disadvantaged.

Perhaps even more significant than the attention of commission after commission and study following on study is the fact that the courts, in their activist role, are forcing a redefinition and reorientation of the fiscal provisions for equalization of educational opportunity. Although the outcomes of these developments are uncertain, it is clear that the movement must lead to a greater emphasis on state and federal funding and to a clear recognition of the differential costs of education, depending on the target group to be educated.

As the need for long-range solutions to pressing community problems is felt, proposals for more careful planning for facilities to house educational programs arise. Exciting, new multi-purpose facilities are being planned and built which in some instances are integrated into the total community plan.

Educational accountability has long rested on faith and on community control. As cities and metropolitan areas grow larger, a feeling of remoteness and powerlessness to influence education increases. The malaise arising from rapid change is coupled with a feeling of loss of control and gives rise to powerful demands for accountability both in terms of a close community relationship to governance and a technological approach to cost effectiveness. Community involvement is not new but its application in urban situations requires new strategies that are being evolved in a variety of approaches which give the citizen not only a voice in control but also sound information about the results of the policies he supports or opposes.

While the public media are disseminating accounts of educational disaster, this review of new and prospective developments gives clear evidence that solutions are feasible. Given the will to apply them, improvements in organization, fiscal equity, in educational opportunities, in the provision of facilities, and in meeting the responsibility to justify the use of resources, are being made.

Footnote References

[1]R. L. Johns, Kearn Alexander, and Dewey H. Stollar, eds., *Status and Impact of Educational Finance Programs* (Gainesville, Florida: National Educational Finance Project, 1971), p. 194.

[2]Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, 1970, Cumulative A.C.I.R. *State Legislative Program*, Washington, D. C., 1969.

[3]Rhode Island Special Commission to Study the Entire Field of Education, *Education in Rhode Island: A Plan for the Future*, Providence, 1968.

[4]Bureau of Educational Finance Research, *The Regional Support of Education in the Albany Capital Area*, Albany, 1968.

[5]Pontiac City School District, *The Human Resources Center: An Innovation in Education*, 1970, ERIC Document No. Ed-048-425.

[6]Corde Corporation, *A Report on the Education Park*, Connecticut, The Corde Corporation, 1968.

[7]Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Task Force on Educational Parks, *The Education Park: Toward a New School in the Nation's Capital*, 1969.

[8]Jack E. Fisher, "Financing Metropolitan Education" (Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, 1971). Mimeographed paper.

[9]Joel Berke, "The Current Crisis in School Finance," *Phi Delta Kappan*, September, 1971.

[10]*Ibid.*

[11]R. L. Johns, Kern Alexander, and Forbis Jordan, eds., *Planning to Finance Education* (Gainesville, Florida: National Educational Finance Project, 1971).

[12]Paul R. Mort, Director, *A New Approach to School Finance* (Albany, New York: The New York State Educational Conference Board, September, 1961).

[13]See Stafford T. Nagatani, *State Support and Operation of Schools in Hawaii–A Case Study Report* (Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1972).

[14]*Plan for Educational Assessment in Florida: Final Report* (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education, 1971).

[15]Lynn P. Cleary, *The Florida Education Improvement Expense Program* (Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education, September, 1970).

[16]James Welsh, *Educational Quality Assessment–Pennsylvania Looks at Its Schools* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Education, September, 1971).

[17]Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser, and Arthur P. Ludka, eds., *Emerging State Responsibilities for Education* (Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1970), pp. 76-80.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 78.

Chapter 5

Developing A Revitalized Educational System*

In the preceding chapters major attention has been given to the problem of improving education in the big cities with special reference to the responsibilities of the state. Following the presentation of basic problems and dilemmas in Chapter 1, detailed attention is given in Chapter 2 to the improvement of the educational program by revitalizing the learning environments, opportunities and procedures; in Chapter 3 to the organization for education and its essential modification to achieve more adequate decision making in the metropolitan areas with state assistance; and in Chapter 4 to the improvement of provisions for support, organization, facilities and accountability.

It is the purpose of this chapter to focus attention on the major constraints which have prevented a more prompt and adequate attack on the problems of the big cities, on the major issues involved in moving to meet the problem and on guidelines for doing so, and finally, to propose and evaluate a number of alternatives for resolving the basic issues. The emphasis here will be on the development of a viable system through which present and emerging needs in the great cities can be met, with special attention to the role of the states in any such system. These and other developments and issues discussed in prior chapters should indicate something of the size of the problem that confronts educators, legislators and, in fact, everyone who is engaged in or concerned about education in the urban setting.

Forces and Factors That Limit State or Local Action

As noted in earlier chapters, the educational needs of hundreds of thousands of people in the big cities are not being met satisfactorily. Among the more important forces and factors which have prevented the more rapid and effective development of programs to meet these educational problems and needs in the large cities are those discussed under the headings below.

---

*Prepared by *Theodore L. Reller*, Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

96 / 97

Large City Stereotypes

For centuries the large city has been seen as an expression of extremes. It has been viewed as the epitome of that which is best in terms of cultural opportunities, education and quality of life—but on the other hand, as the epitome of that which is worst in terms of crime, corruption, inability to be governed.

Some of the attitudes of people in this country toward the large cities were reflected in the practices in many states which provided, until only a few years ago, that a rural legislator would represent many fewer people than an urban one. These attitudes are apparently not confined to any one nation, as shown by the book entitled *L'etat contre Paris.*[1]* This volume, written by the chairman of the Paris city council, called attention to the growing urban problems and the lag in investments in Paris by the national government. The thought expressed is somewhat related to that of Mayor Lindsay in his statement advocating statehood for New York City.[2] Opponents of the idea point out that New York City, as a state, might indeed find Congress not too friendly or receptive to its needs and views.[3]

In addition to the attitudes of many people in the states toward the large cities, it should be noted that many who reside in a metropolitan area adjacent to the core city seem to have antagonistic feelings toward the city itself. The fact that cities generally ceased to grow through annexation some thirty or forty years ago may be a related phenomenon. Thus negative attitudes toward the large city tend to abound.

The Fragmentation of Government

Local government in metropolitan areas is generally so fragmented that there has been great difficulty in getting communities to unite on matters of area-wide concern. When they do unite, it is frequently only to meet a problem which quite clearly affects all of them and cannot be resolved other than through a unified effort. Typical are such metropolitan problems as smog, transportation and water. But, to a rather remarkable degree, people tend to consider themselves as citizens of a small political unit rather than as citizens of a metropolitan area. The Research and Policy Committee of the Committee on Economic Development reported that in 1967 there were 233 standard metropolitan areas (containing nearly two thirds of the population of the nation) and that these were served by 20,703 local governments.[4] The average was, thus, 91 local governments per metropolitan area, but the extremes were great. The Chicago metropolitan area, for example, had 1,113 local governments. The Committee also reported that most metropolitan residents "are served by at least four separate local governments—a county, a municipality or a township, a school district, and one or more special districts."[5] Some, of course, are served by many more independent local governments. Such fragmentation makes it difficult for citizens to become informed or to take action on many important matters. It sharply reduces

*Footnote references are given at end of the chapter.

the possibility that citizens of the area will give appropriate attention to metropolitan problems. Moreover, it frequently means that the metropolitan area has little power in the legislature where it may tend to immobilize itself as a result of urban versus suburban conflict.

Isolation of Education from Other Services

The question as to whether education should be independent from other local government services has been argued for many years. Many educators have sought both fiscal independence and independence in services provided. Such independence may have had some importance in an earlier period or be needed in rural areas where other services have not been developed. However, in the increasingly complex metropolitan areas it is difficult to defend.

Moreover, the recent efforts to distinguish *schooling* from *education* reflect the need for some reinterpretation and a broader perspective on education and what it implies. The recognition that much of the learning of the child occurs in the pre-school period, in the home, community, communications industry, world of work—and that it is closely related to housing, welfare, and health, for example—indicates that the traditional kind or amount of independence needs to be reduced. It also suggests that schooling may have a larger impact on education if closely related to other services and activities. However, despite the rather general recognition of the need for coordination involving education and other services, it appears that much remains to be accomplished in this area. Too frequently the struggle to overcome the fragmented system of general local government does not seem to many people to have any direct implications for or application to the education services.

Controversies Within the Educational System

The controversies and struggles within large city educational systems have been intense in recent years—so intense, in fact, that states may have preferred to ignore or avoid them. These struggles have taken many forms and have pertained to many issues and have included such matters as:

- The failure of the system to educate the children of substantial sections of the population;
- The lack of representativeness of the board of education;
- The over-bureaucratization and unresponsiveness of the system;
- Approaches to decentralization (not clearly defined); and
- Community control and teacher power.

The attempts to resolve these problems have, at times, resulted in a bitter struggle between old, established—but somewhat insecure—bureaucracies and the new, aggressive—and not necessarily tactful or experienced—developmental organizations within or outside of the educational systems. Perhaps no one should be faulted for not wishing to enter such an arena.

COMPLEXITY OF PROBLEM AREAS

The problems confronting education in the metropolitan area include those involving general government, those pertaining more directly to education, and the factors related to both of these.

Woodbury pointed out some years ago that a metropolitan area may be looked at in at least four ways:

1. As an economic unit or entity producing goods and services and exchanging them within its own boundaries and outside of them.
2. As a congeries of local governments and of public and quasi-public agencies, most of them corporate, legal entities with various powers, functions and responsibilities.
3. As a gigantic physical plant: the land, buildings, streets, transit and transport lines, parks, public buildings, utilities, and other artifacts within and through which the economic, governmental and other social activities are carried on.
4. As a social structure or, if the term be properly qualified, a social organism made up of various groups and institutions in various stages of growth, equilibrium and decay, and with almost numberless ties and relationships among themselves and with communities outside.

He also commented:

> These four cities, of course, are not separate, discrete entities; they are simply different aspects of the complex reality. They are tied together and influence each other in numberless ways. No framework for urban studies will be very useful if it fails to recognize all four cities and at least the principal ties and influence among them.[6]

It should also be noted that even in the field of education much "flying somewhat blind" is inevitable. Definitive and acceptable answers to many pertinent questions or concerns unfortunately are not yet available. Some of these are:

- What, if any, organization can and should be substituted for a board of education?
- What factors have largest promise in terms of learning on the part of the alienated child or youth?
- How much and what kind of decentralization is essential or desirable?
- What does community control offer under what conditions?
- What is the promise (if any) and what are the implications of "de-schooling"?
- Can the community replace the school plant as the educational facility?

Given the difficulties and some of the experiences we have had, one can understand Banfield when he comments:

> All of the serious problems of the cities are largely insoluble now and will be for the foreseeable future and, second, that insofar as it is open to government (federal, state and local) to affect the situation, it tends to behave perversely—that is, not to do the things that would make it better, but instead to do those that will make it worse.[7]

Lack of Understanding of Metropolitan Government

The traditional view that metropolitan government is local administration severely restricts action at various governmental levels and limits initiative in planning. Walsh has spoken to this problem very effectively: "By urban government is meant not simply local government, but a constellation of municipal, regional, state and central agencies interacting to manage and shape the urban giant."[8] This statement increasingly describes education in the metropolis. She also observed that: "Integration of urban government everywhere entails, not placing all responsibility in one authority, but harnessing the actions of many authorities at several levels to common or compatible goals."[9]

Walsh further noted that the

> . . . continuing operations of urban government comprise plans, decisions, and physical activities of a constellation of actors at every administrative level—national, state or provincial, and local . . . In nearly all great metropolises, every important level of government participates in every major public-service category.[10]

Thus, to ask which level of government provides which services is to raise the wrong question. Frequently central and state governments provide some funds and set general regulations while local and metropolitan governments plan and manage services. Walsh observes that this pattern of role distribution is highly important in that: "it renders decision making complex and arduous" and necessitates "intensive intergovernmental communications—negotiation, bargaining, and exchange of viewpoints and information" in order "to operate the system with any degree of dispatch and harmony and to overcome its inherent bias toward stalemate."[11]

Generally the idea of tiers of government for educational purposes in the metropolis is relatively new in our society. It can scarcely be said, therefore, as Walsh says of Paris, that:

> . . . what is most notable about urban government in Paris is that authorities have recognized, first, that the urban complex is a dynamic phenomenon that must be approached from a comprehensive stance if it is to be guided along lines that will increase the satisfaction of its inhabitants; and, second, that efficient provisions of urban services requires diverse organizational arrangements utilizing [the proper mixture of] local, areawide and national structures alike.[12]

The Image of the State

There is widespread doubt about the interest of the state in the large city problems and in the ability of the state to act effectively with reference to them. State legislatures have traditionally been perceived as being controlled by the rural areas. Moreover, most state education agencies have been largely staffed by personnel from the smaller school districts and usually have been so inadequately staffed that they could work effectively only with the areas having the least capability to assume bona fide responsibility for education, that is, the rural and village districts. In fact, the large cities have generally had staffs that appeared to be far more competent than those of most state departments of education to deal with the problems of education in these cities. The result of these perceptions

and conditions has been that, in most states, the cities have not expected any leadership or even assistance from state departments of education. Thus the image and the condition of the state with reference to the large cities have provided blocks to effective relations with, or services from, the state education agencies in many states. It is also necessary to recognize, however, that until quite recently the educational systems of the cities were regarded as among the best in the state and, therefore, did not seem to be in serious need of assistance.

Lack of any Tradition and Structures for Planning

In the field of education, society has been slow to accept and use planning as a means of meeting major challenges. This is the result of several factors including the view that to plan is totalitarian rather than democratic in nature.[13] It also is related to the fact that, generally, ample resources have been available to meet recognized problems and that most people have believed in the importance of a continuously growing economy and the need for expanding provisions for services. Further, our earlier experiences with various studies and reports that attempted to blueprint the future have not convinced many people that effective planning is possible or that systematic long-range planning should be encouraged.

In spite of this background, we have slowly come to recognize the necessity for planning, and to understand and appreciate its possible contributions as well as its limitations. The vast, complex, interrelated changes in urban life, which continue with or without planning, urgently demand more careful study than has been common. Unless there is systematic planning for improvements, the very stability of our society is seriously threatened. In the light of the growing evidence, there has also developed a more humble expectation from planning. Walsh has noted that:

> . . . plans that purport to be holistic grand designs, vast and comprehensive models of future society, are interesting, but usually utopian. Moreover, man is as capable of planning himself into misery and ugliness as he is of stumbling into them.[14]

However, man cannot afford to fail to use his intelligence in formulating comprehensive policies, harmonizing goals, seeking greater agreement among the many actors in the metropolitan scene, and in establishing an agenda to focus and organize debate, examining activities not only in terms of an annual budget and incremental changes but also in terms of long-range needs and resources, broadening the available base of information as the basis for decision making, identifying alternative plans and their probable results, and introducing innovation into the metropolitan government scene which may be heavily laden with inertia.

Some Background Experiences

The discussion in the previous section may be regarded by some readers as heavily negative and as offering little promise for future developments. However, it must be noted that in correspondence with and

comments by superintendents of large city school systems and chief state school officers a more optimistic note is emerging. While some of these administrators believe the past cannot be shaken off—that little or nothing in relation to the major needs has been achieved or seems to be in prospect—others are convinced that some promising beginnings have been made. Some of the more promising developments are discussed under the headings below. It is important to note that these developments involve cooperative actions by legislatures, by state educational agencies, and by the big cities.

Modification of District Structure

Since each state is primarily responsible for provisions for the education of its students, one of its most important and potentially significant goals should be an adequate structure and plan for organizing school districts. At least two types of development are important in this area. One is the attainment of a more adequate organization for each metropolitan area or at least a major portion of the area. The achievement of this goal may involve the replacement of traditional intermediate units (counties in many states) with a metropolitan unit or perhaps the establishment of state educational agency field offices in the metropolitan area to service the needs of the *area* rather than merely those of the present multitude of units. A second development is the provision by the legislature for some kind of decentralized structure for large cities. Some provisions along this line have already been made for New York City[15] and Detroit. In several other states (for example, California) considerable attention has been given to this approach but thus far there has been no important legislative action.

In considering background experiences pertaining to modification in district structure, attention should also be directed to the development of metropolitan governments in Toronto and London. These are among the most significant developments relating to metropolitan governments, and indicate that problems of the metropolis are not restricted to any one nation. Further, both of these developments have taken place in democratic societies. The procedures followed in establishing them may be quite suggestive and helpful in other areas. In both Toronto and London the relation of education to other service of the metropolitan area was an important consideration while the proposals were being developed.

These are good illustrations of the possibility, if not the essentiality, of two-tier government in large metropolitan areas. In both of these cases the provisions for a metropolitan government were established by action of the body responsible for the determination of district structure without a vote by the citizens, but after extended inquiry, consultation and hearings. In both areas, the local administration of education remained the responsibility of a separate board or committee, although not one that was "independent" of general local government. In the case of London, education in the city was made a responsibility of the Inner London Education Authority for the central area (which was formerly largely the area served by the London County Council) and of the Education Committees

of each of the respective boroughs surrounding the central area. Thus, under the Greater London Council, two ways to resolve the question of the educational service in relation to general local government were provided.[16]

It should not be assumed, however, that these provisions for metropolitan government have resolved the problem of structure for education in the metropolitan area but rather that, in both places, they have moved in a highly significant manner to resolve it, and that we cannot afford to be uninformed regarding their efforts and the resulting achievements and unsatisfactory developments.

Changes in the State Education Agencies

The most common development in this regard is the establishment of a division or other unit of urban affairs in the state education agency under an assistant superintendent. Another suggested procedure is the use of an affirmative action program to increase the number of staff of the state education agency who are familiar with and competent in urban education. Finally, it should be noted that there has been some increase in the number of chief state school officers and department staff members who have had administrative or other related experience in urban situations. This development seems to be somewhat related to the decrease in the number of states in which the state superintendent is elected by popular vote.

Organization of Big Cities

In a few states which have a number of large cities, organizations representing the city school systems have developed. The purpose of such organizations varies somewhat from state to state. In Texas, for example, the state education agency conducted a study and prepared a report on "The Role of the Texas Education Agency in Urban School Development Over the Next Decade."[17] Through this study the staff and superintendents of the seven largest districts in Texas made known their needs and expectations relating to the role of and the services to be provided by the state education agency. Leading administrators of the state education agency and of the large cities were deeply involved in this development. Communication was greatly improved. Growing out of the study, which continues, was a proposed program plan for the office of urban education of the state agency which was established in September, 1971. New Jersey established an Urban Schools Development Council in 1968 with a broad program of activities. In 1972, its activities were transferred in large part to the New Jersey State Department of Education.

Changes in Provisions for Financing Education

More adequate financing of schools in the large cities remains a major area regarding which cities cite the states for inaction or inadequate action. This was emphasized by Mark Shedd, then Superintendent of Schools in Philadelphia, who stated:

> After going through four years of almost continual financial crisis during

> which time the amount of subsidy from the state government has increased but has had no effect whatsoever on our ability to move forward, I have come to the conclusion that it's beyond the capability of state governments to equitably finance public education in our large cities.[18]

On the other hand, certain developments are cited as offering possible breakthroughs. These include the increasing number of states that recognize "the urban factor" in one manner or another in their plans for financing education, the assumption of more direct state responsibility for certain aspects of the program (such as the acceptance of full responsibility for financing school construction in Maryland, and the growing conviction that the overdependence on property taxes will require a major shift along the lines suggested by the *Serrano* case in California and other related cases).

Federal Actions and Impact

An important factor that has stimulated state concern and activity regarding education in the big cities during the last decade has been the growing federal concern and activity that has directly or indirectly challenged the states to move forward in this area. In addition, there have been a number of specific programs including: (1) federal aid to strengthen state departments of education—paralleling federal action to improve the education of the poor, many of whom were to be found in the big cities; (2) programs to assist in the education of the poor which necessitated closer working relationships with the big cities; (3) the model cities programs which called for closer working relations between schools and other governmental activities in many big cities and provided a challenge to state departments of education because of the distance schools found themselves from many of those involved in model cities programs; and (4) the actions of the federal courts regarding desegregation which stimulated some state education agencies to act in this area.

All in all, the past decade has been one in which the great cities have increasingly carried their burdens and demands to the federal government —having decided that they would not be successful in the states. These demands pertained to many essential developments in the cities, of which education was only one. They demonstrated, however, the necessity for coordinating the attack on the problems of education in the big cities with the attack on the variety of social and political problems calling for solution or significant effort toward amelioration.

Some Guidelines for State-Large City Action

In this section, several guidelines will be proposed that should be helpful in considering, and especially in evaluating, the alternatives discussed in the final section of the chapter. These obviously represent judgments rather than established truths. At least they may be used as a basis for discussion and, thus, for the strengthening of plans developed in various state-big city proposals.

The alternatives developed should be comprehensive.

Other things being equal, the alternatives developed for consideration should center attention on the major areas and issues discussed in this volume. For example, instruction, learning, organization of schools and school districts and finance should be dealt with as highly interrelated aspects of education. Thus, financial adjustments without changes in structure are not likely to provide the returns sought, or desegregation without other related steps in the metropolitan area may well be of relatively little value.

All programs developed should be long-range—with short-range phases of the proposal outlined.

Too little long-range attention has been given to state-big city issues. The extreme urgency of problems has tended to focus—and sometimes force—the attention of the big cities and state education agencies on the current scene, thus making it difficult for them to look ahead more than one year. The limited planning and action taken by states and districts with reference to structure in metropolitan areas is believed to have been a major factor influencing the courts to act as they have recently in the cases of Richmond and Detroit. Few studies have analyzed relevant factors and offered long-range goals pertaining to structure and related matters in metropolitan areas.

Many agencies and services other than "schools" must be involved.

In any proposal, schooling as well as education must be integrated into housing, the home, the community, local government, industry, welfare, the library system, communication media. Assuming that socio-economic status is a major factor related to learning, it is imperative that agencies other than the school, which relate to this factor, be substantially involved.

A basic need should be seen as that of "development administration".

Development administration has been defined as concentrating attention on "the administrative requisites for achieving public policy goals," especially when these goals "involve dramatic political, economic and social transformations."[19] Acceptance of this concept will involve changes in the attitudes and habits of some public personnel who may be marked by "conservatism, lack of initiative, fear of blame and formalistic performance of duties."[20] Plans should provide for challenging these conditions.

Any long-range attack on the problem should be on a metropolitan area basis rather than just in the large city.

To push for a "solution" for the large city as something apart from the metropolitan area may serve only to make the eventual necessary attack upon a major problem more difficult. Such a problem is a fundamental one of the area rather than of one part of it. The development of

a plan whereby the metropolitan area will become a unity for appropriate purposes may necessarily be a part of carefully developed programs which will result in significant (not illusory) decentralization and opportunity for more involvement of citizens.

A program for adapting government to urban challenges involves "a process of complex change that depends not upon isolated reforms but upon broad strategies"[21]

For example, the attempt to decentralize the large city in an effort to reduce the red tape of tight centralization may indeed result in greater delays if financing adjustments are not made and if local personnel are not prepared to carry the new responsibilities. Again, it must be recognized that changes are closely intertwined with the power and interests of actors in local politics—the staff, various citizen groups, political parties, economic interests.

The state-large city problems must be viewed as mutual problems.

In planning, development of structure, and administration both the state and city authorities should view the federal government as a potential partner in the change effort or plan. Initiative regarding various aspects of the needed change may properly be undertaken by either the large city or the state. But realization of any program or effort will have to involve a high level of cooperation on the part of all concerned.

Research and development are important elements in any program and should be utilized more effectively.

The relations between universities and both the large cities and state educational agencies have not facilitated essential research on problems relating to large city-state issues. There has been a mutual lack of understanding and respect between the governmental agencies and the universities. Universities have centered much too little research effort on the problems of the metropolis and of education in it, and have been too little concerned—and often have not been prepared to assist—with the development of long-range plans. Research and development need to be emphasized not only through the universities, even though they should be among the more important participants in this work. Given the rapid change in the metropolitan areas and in virtually all aspects of education in them—from the values of young people to the administrative structures and the attempt to produce change in them—the need for research and development can scarcely be overemphasized.

The state education agency should be structured as a viable, dynamic and project-oriented, organizational system.

This means that the organization of a state education agency should be "characterized by a high degree of interdependence among its component elements;" that "the functional attributes of the organization are custom designed to carry out the missions of the organization;[22] and that project organizations may be regarded as *ad hoc,* disposable, or at least transitory. The need for security or stability obviously must also be recog-

nized. However, the issues with which we are involved are of such proportions that the "institutionalizing of structure" could easily occur much too early in many states. An organization that can utilize the larger resources of the state education agency and of large cities flexibly would appear to be imperative.

Planning must be accepted as an essential element in the process.

The state-large city issues are so complex that, unless there is careful planning, little hope can be held for important and desirable changes. The changes, furthermore, must be primarily at the state and local (metropolitan) levels but must also involve the federal level. Consideration clearly must be given to finance and structure but equally to the processes of administration and especially to the processes of instruction and learning (the major purpose of education). Structure and politics must be examined in their interrelationships if reasonable returns are to be achieved. Attention must be given to change in education as well as to other public and private agencies where activities impinge on education or vice versa. Planning may be carried on by general government planning agencies, by educational planning agencies, by both, or by a combination of these. Central at this time is the recognition of the need for long-range planning and the development of provisions to facilitate it. As suggested earlier, the plan may not always be realized fully–but at least it should constitute an agenda, a procedure through which greater understanding of the dimensions of the problem may be achieved. Without it the alternative promises to be little more than drift and emergency action.

Alternatives for Resolving the State-Large City Issues

In this section, consideration will be given to the major alternatives that should be carefully considered in the process of attempting to resolve state-large city issues in terms of structure and working relationships which are desired, and the procedures in achieving these structures. Some of the "alternatives" suggested may well be regarded as providing only partial "solutions," and as having significance only if viewed as one part of a more comprehensive structure or procedure. The alternatives are discussed here, however, because they, sometimes alone or along with other factors, have been suggested–or may be regarded–as possible advances.

Alternative Structural Conditions or Working Relationships

There are many conceivable alternatives involving or relating to structure, policy and procedure. Several of the more commonly utilized or proposed possibilities are listed and briefly discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Maintain the present situation.

This, it may be argued, is not an alternative, or at least not a desirable one. It should, however, probably be listed as one possibility that is

available for consideration. Small or incremental changes will occur without any major initiative, but as a result of the powerful forces at work relating to the financing of education, the changing economy of the nation, the unhappiness with the present system and the belief by some people that the present system is a failure. Changes that have been occurring with reference to the organization of state departments of education and to state financing of education are suggestive of the types of changes which are to be expected unless a drive for very substantial change becomes dominant. Changes of this kind are unplanned, poorly planned, or unproductive.

Nationalize the big city systems.

Shedd[23] recommended this drastic step—proposing that the national government assume responsibility for the operation and total funding of schools in the big cities. He apparently made the recommendation primarily because he had become convinced that equitable financing of education in the big cities was beyond the capability of state and local governments and that, unless such action were taken, the urban educational system would collapse. He noted the great annual increase in costs of urban education during the past decade and that increased subsidies during this period had no appreciable effect on the ability of the cities to deal effectively with the need. He also noted that Philadelphia contributed about three-quarters of a billion dollars each year to the state of Pennsylvania and received back only a quarter of a billion. Underlying this proposal are several assumptions including the one that the federal government should finance education in the big cities as it has financed space exploration—rather than (as critics of the proposal might observe) as it has financed education in Washington, D. C., or aspects of education in other urban situations. Shedd's proposal would *solve the issue of state-large city relationships through the elimination for the need for their development,* but it might also result in some unanticipated problems in certain states. Moreover, in its present form, it would not immediately contribute to the solution of the problem of an overall government for the metropolitan area. It could, of course, be argued that if the large cities became healthy (financially able and highly effective educationally), they and their surrounding areas could more readily bridge the gulf that separates them.

Provide for direct state operation of schools.

Current reawakening and concerns about the inequality of educational opportunities in states and in the nation, stimulated by court decisions such as *Serrano vs Priest* in California, and other developments have encouraged thinking in the direction of increased state financing and of the possibility of full state funding and state operation of schools as in Hawaii.

Under this plan the large cities now operating as "independent" units would probably be replaced by "field offices" of a state education agency. The large city might indeed become one of the state divisions through

which schools would be operated. To maintain some feeling of local responsibility, the field office might be a modified one assisted by an advisory committee with powers sharply reduced from those of the present board of education. Basically, however, authority and major policy would flow from a superior hierarchical level, and supervision or control would be over operating agencies rather than over local boards and chief executives. Honolulu provides a good illustration of how such an arrangement might function. This kind of arrangement would resolve the state department-large city issue by eliminating the partnership relationship. It could facilitate the establishment of a metropolitan geographical unit, since the regional office might appropriately serve an area larger than the big city. It would probably result in substantial reductions in inequalities (in terms of dollars) in education, but it would not necessarily insure more adequate funds to meet the educational needs of the large cities.

A variant of this alternative might also result if extremely large cities such as New York were to become states as recommended recently by Mayor Lindsay. Through this plan he would hope the new state could retain, or regain, a larger share of the tax money which New York City now pays to the federal government. There are those, of course, who believe that the "State of the City of New York" would indeed have a difficult time winning approval of other states for what it probably would propose.

Strengthen the state education agencies.

There can be little question concerning the desirability of increasing the ability of state education agencies to help to resolve the educational problems of the large cities, at least in a considerable number of states. As previously noted, some progress has been made in this direction during the last decade. This approach or alternative would require staffing of state departments of education with the best qualified personnel available (which is desirable under any arrangement), then shaping and operating these departments so that they will be highly effective in providing the leadership and services needed to improve education. Possibly we are nearing the end of the period during which outstanding city or local superintendents would not consider appointment to or serving in the position as chief state school officer. The establishment of a division of urban education and the appointment of an assistant superintendent for urban education are appropriate steps. However, attention also must be given to the organization of the division or unit in accordance with a plan that will ensure flexibility and the ability to draw upon the total resources of the department. Provision should also be made through the organizational plan to involve one or more of the ablest city administrators—either on leave or through some other appropriate arrangement—in state department work on various programs.

Develop and implement a comprehensive state plan to enable the state to meet the state-large city issue.

Such a plan would involve a number of elements which should be developed in a coordinated manner. In many states it is unlikely that any

such plan will be implemented unless the governor and leaders in the legislature recognize the necessity for moving in this direction. This plan should involve strengthening the state department of education as indicated in the preceding discussion. Moreover, it should provide plans for substantially increased state participation in the financing of education. It must further provide procedures through which more adequate metropolitan local units can be established and provide through statutes for decentralization of such units. The state must recognize that the development of adequate district structure is one of its most important responsibilities and that the present structure, both within and surrounding the big cities, is highly ineffective. Finally, it must act to improve the administration of education through programs to develop essential competencies to organize and administer metropolitan units and their component subdistricts.

Develop a metropolitan government structure for education.

It seems apparent that:

> The basic dilemma of the unorganized metropolis is that it lacks effective political power commensurate with its economic and social importance. A primary concern of metropolitan organization is, then, not consolidating administration in neat packages (which seldom stay neat in operation), but increasing the capacity of the urban political system to decide, to act, and to stimulate change, in other words, mobilizing regional power.[24]

Unless the metropolis finds some type of organization through which it can develop a consciousness of its central problems (basically common to all of its parts), it will lose its power to the state or federal government. This would be regrettable because it is unlikely that state or federal governments in the long run are as likely to engage in the essential experimentation, to show the initiative, or to produce the variety and the responsiveness which are inherent in a metropolis.

Developments along these lines relating to education would desirably be closely related to developments pertaining to general government. They need not, however, be tightly tied to them, as provisions in both Toronto and London illustrate. Possibly education can and should lead the way to metropolitan government in our society because it is more widely regarded as a state responsibility and therefore as a service for which there is broader concern than for many other services provided by local government. Furthermore, state governments have a direct opportunity to develop a more adequate metropolitan structure for education than for many other services.

Whether or not this opportunity in and for education is recognized would be difficult to establish. In the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area, for example, in which a long battle for a significant regional government was recently lost in the legislature, education was not even considered in the discussions. Education remains a local district-state service or issue and, in the mind of the public and of professional educators, has few if any implications for "metropolitanism."A program of the type suggested here should provide not only for the ability to act for the metropolitan area

but should also provide for decentralization—for sub-units with substantial powers which would be more than field offices of the metropolitan unit. Decentralization is essential as contrasted with distribution of power to offices which act almost exclusively on behalf of the metropolitan authority.

Develop a comprehensive program involving state and metropolitan action aimed at structure, redefinition of respective responsibilities, finance and instruction.

This alternative would draw upon the more promising elements in a number of the alternatives previously discussed. It would, however, consider these elements as a totality. This approach is believed essential because of the interrelatedness of various of the elements. For example, it is difficult to develop a defensible program pertaining to the state education agency without rethinking organization and functioning at the local (metropolitan) level. Provisions for essential experimentation and evaluation (which are imperative if the instructional program is to move forward in an effective manner) are closely related to structure, staffing at state and local levels, and finance. There is, of course, the danger or probability that, if a package involving the necessary elements is not developed, educational financing can be changed substantially and even increased considerably without any notable effects on learning. It has been well demonstrated that state financing provisions can freeze undesirable structures and practices. Often the ultimate consequences of action pertaining to one aspect of the complex state-large city problem have been unknown or unanticipated by proponents of the action.

The *total* or comprehensive approach to long-range planning is therefore advocated for several reasons, including:

- The inadequacy, and even unsatisfactory results, of piecemeal approaches have been demonstrated;
- The conditions in the urban area are sufficiently difficult (chaotic, desperate) to make possible the development of broad support for such a program;
- Technology now makes possible analyses of proposals which will provide a more adequate base for making judgments;
- Pressure for action in terms of certain elements of the program (finance, for example) are so strong that action is highly probable; and
- Only a *total* approach provides reasonable assurance regarding the desirability of actions proposed.

The *total program* suggested here should involve agencies other than those involved with schooling. A reappraisal of the relation of the educational service to other local government services is one of the areas calling for restudy. Similarly, the relation of schools to the community in terms of homes, welfare, industry and employment is an essential consideration.

Some may insist that the package proposed is so comprehensive that it will inevitably become vague or general—that it will fail because the resources needed to attack it will be spread too thin. These difficulties must be recognized even though they are not believed to be so formidable that the goal should not be sought. The implementation of any such plan would always require a considerable period of time, but this period would provide a basis for estimating whether steps being proposed or taken hold great promise or whether they would almost certainly be unproductive because of their interrelatedness to other factors that had not previously been considered.

Procedures in Achieving Alternatives

As indicated earlier, it has been thought desirable to look at alternatives in terms of goals, structure and operation and then to consider alternative strategies or procedures for achieving them. But the dangers in this approach should be recognized because it may suggest or imply that the conditions sought are clearly established and not especially dynamic. In fact, the reverse may be true. For example, structure, without the political processes through which it may be achieved and nourished (matured) is of little value. The separate treatment of the desired ends and of the method of achieving them is dangerous. However, much of the danger can probably be avoided if there is a genuine awareness of it.

The achievement of the desired alternative or alternatives is dependent upon at least two major factors: (1) the development of sound, comprehensive programs which hold genuine promise of meeting the challenge of the state-large city issue; and (2) the communication of the problem and its possible "solution" and the mobilization of the resources and energy which are essential for implementation of the solution. But these two factors are deeply intertwined. However, the development of sound programs requires detailed study with participation by many parties. It also requires that, through such study, common goals will be established and agreement reached on a program which has considerable promise in terms of the goals. Moreover, it necessitates far more careful studies and the formulation of possible forward advances (proposed steps) than have been undertaken in most of the states—even in states which have the state-large city issue most sharply before them.

These studies and the planning procedures could well result in rather different programs in different states, because the issues are of widely different magnitude, with different historical backgrounds, and different mixes of resources and attitudes today in the respective states. Even in a given state there is not necessarily a single solution because the cities vary in their conditions and needs. Moreover, whether it be a matter of planning or informed compromise, the ability of the English Parliament, for example, to provide for two structural solutions to the problem of the metropolis in London, is commendable because there is no one quick, sure and easy way known to relate education (schooling) to the general local government and to the community. Therefore, some planned variety, the results of which can be studied, is in order.

If implementation of a plan is to be achieved, the essential political processes should also be developed as one facet of the plan. Appropriate study procedures will indeed provide much needed communication and will go a considerable distance in identifying and attracting many of the resources essential for implementation. If this is done, a base will have been established for the essential, powerful, and direct drive toward the goals—whether they pertain most directly to the state, the metropolis or to the interrelation of the two.

Suggestions for Studies and Procedures

On the basis of these general understandings, including some possible alternatives, the suggestions that follow are offered as approaches to the study and solution of the problems.

The public-policy goals regarding the state-big city issues must be clarified.

This step is essential without regard to the alternative procedures outlined below. Unless some measure of agreement can be reached concerning the desired end, no procedure is likely to prove to be very effective. All parties directly involved (state and local, professional and nonprofessional, teacher and administrator, universities and planning agencies, planners and administrators, legislators and private groups) should participate in the development of agreements as to goals. Representatives of local authorities other than the big cities—suburban and rural—should also participate. If they do not, those not directly involved may veto the whole program in the legislature or otherwise. In the process of clarifying goals, the representatives of the groups involved may also provide some valuable suggestions concerning the resources available and the viability of the alternative procedures.

The metropolitan or regional planning body could desirably be charged with the study of education along with other services of concern to the metropolitan area.

Under the direction of such a body, a special task force could work through the problems of education in relation both to the area and general local government and to the state. This process should provide a comprehensiveness which is essential in metropolitan affairs. Care should be taken to provide for competent spokesmen for the state and federal agencies as well as for institutionalized schooling. Frequently such planning agencies have been viewed as undercutting the school system. This possibility must be avoided while new approaches and even a new structure is sought. The approach through the metropolitan or regional planning agency would have the advantage of bringing some highly competent planning staff members into the action relating to education. It should also bring the agencies other than the schools into a study of problems in a beneficial way.

The educational authorities of the metropolitan area could undertake the essential planning and development of basic understandings.

Increasing recognition of the commonality of the educational prob-

lems of the school districts of a metropolitan area could make this type of development one to be expected. Changes in state support plans for education could also stimulate it. If this approach is used, provisions should be made for substantial involvement of non-school agencies. Local and state agencies should also be involved—recognizing, as suggested earlier, that while education may be called a function of the state (legally), in actuality its effective provision is the responsibility of the local (metropolitan and its subunits), state and federal governments.

The state education agency could accept the challenge for carrying on essential studies and for developing and obtaining passage of a legislative program pertaining to the large city-state issues.

It is difficult to imagine a responsibility which could more appropriately be accepted by the state education agency. In a few states—including but not limited to New Jersey, Texas, Ohio and Massachusetts—there are important stirrings in this direction. New York State probably represents the clearest and most effective commitment in this direction, especially as the issue relates to New York City. The New York state education agency recognized the problem in New York City some years ago and has played a constructive role in such matters as securing legislation pertaining to decentralization, to implementation of a decentralized system, and to assisting in administration in periods of emergency.

The state legislature could take essential direct action regarding matters of structure and finance.

It is assumed that if the state were to provide a more adequate metropolitan structure with decentralization provisions, the state education agency could contribute more significantly to meeting the educational problems in the metropolis. The legislature should recognize that establishing appropriate structure is one of its basic responsibilities—and that unless it makes defensible provisions in this regard, it is almost certainly going to be drawn increasingly into details relating to various aspects of the service which it is relatively incompetent to handle. It should accept the fact that adequate metropolitan structure will almost certainly not be developed if it is made dependent upon voter approval by separate existing districts. In matters of finance the legislature must also act with reference to metropolitan areas—rather than solely with reference to the existing district structure. Concerning matters of curriculum and instruction, it is generally agreed that the state should establish only broad guidelines, then encourage a sound local organization to innovate, experiment, and evaluate.

The State Planning Commission could provide the essential leadership for an attack on the big city-state issues.

In the second approach discussed, it was suggested that the metropolitan planning agency might be given responsibility for the study of the big city-state issues. Much the same argument can be made for fixing responsibility upon the State Planning Commission (if there is one)—but

many of the same limitations would exist. Such planning agencies are variously developed in the several states and metropolitan areas. Some of them do, however, have an expertise not otherwise found in public bodies. They have had some experience in looking at the problems in terms of goals and resources and over a time period rather than in terms of the annual or biennial budget. They, of course, would need to be assisted by "educators"—those responsible for the annual budget and those less institutionalized. A state agency would probably have an advantage over a metropolitan agency in that it could see the issue from a state perspective and possibly in terms of the federal implications and relations. On the other hand, it might lack understanding of the complexity of the metropolitan issues and of the issues involved in decentralization.

The most promising procedure might indeed be provision for a comprehensive study and plan development by a commission established and financed by the legislature.

This study should examine the interrelationships existing with reference to various issues and could develop a plan recognizing both the complexity of the metropolitan issues and the problem of the relations to state and federal governments and agencies. It should involve, among others, the staff of planning agencies, universities, and perhaps private research and study groups which have an important contribution to make. Whether or not this procedure is indicated may depend upon the extent to which the big city or metropolitan-state problems are seen as among the most important confronting the state with implications for all sections of the state. If a commission is not recognized in these terms, then, very probably, it would not be established and provided with sufficient resources and support to be highly productive. Without such recognition of the problem, it is likely that implementation would not occur.

Provision should be made for continuous revision and effective implementation of any plans and procedures that are developed.

Without this provision, there is little likelihood that action taken with reference to the big city-state problems will be much more than emergency action—action growing out of demands of the moment, actions which are not based upon a careful analysis of the "ungovernable," dynamic metropolises or the development of plans to capture their strengths and guide them toward the assurance of a "quality of life" more acceptable to man. Only if some competent agency is charged with the responsibility for revision and implementation can appropriate action be expected.

Footnote References

[1]Alian Griotteray, *L'etat contre Paris* (Paris: Hachette, 1962).

[2]John V. Lindsay, "Chartering 'National Cities'," *Current*, July-August, 1971, pp. 9-11.

[3]Richard Reeves, "Statehood for Cities: The Impossible Dream," *Saturday Review*, September 4, 1971, pp. 18-21.

[4]Committee for Economic Development, *Reshaping Government in Metropolitan Areas* (New York: The Committee, 1970), p. 13.

[5]*Ibid.*

[6]Coleman Woodbury, *A Framework for Urban Studies* (Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, Publication 722, 1959), p. 9.

[7]Edward C. Banfield, "Why Government Cannot Solve the Urban Problem," *Daedalus*, Fall, 1968, p. 1231.

[8]Annamarie Hauck Walsh, *The Urban Challenge to Government* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969), p. 6.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 42.

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 128.

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 129.

[12]Annamarie Hauck Walsh, *Urban Government for the Paris Region* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1968), p. 207.

[13]Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser, and Arthur P. Ludka, *Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education* (Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1971), p. 40.

[14]Annamarie Hauck Walsh, *The Urban Challenge to Government*, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[15]Ewald B. Nyquist, *The Role of the State in Urban Education* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, Institute of Social Science, February, 1971).

[16]Theodore L. Reller, "The Greater London Council and The Education Service," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Spring, 1968, pp. 5-18.

[17]Texas Education Agency, *The Role of the Texas Education Agency in Urban School Development Over the Next Decade* (Austin, Texas: The Agency, May, 1971).

[18]Mark R. Shedd, Letter of October 8, 1971, to author.

[19]Ferrel Heady, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 10.

[20]Annamarie Hauck Walsh, *The Urban Challenge to Government*, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[21]*Ibid.*, p. 39.

[22]Arthur D. Little, Inc., *A New Organizational System for State-Level Educational Administration* (Sacramento, California: State Department of Education, 1967), p. 9.

[23]Mark R. Shedd, Testimony to the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Washington, D. C., September 21, 1971.

[24]Annamarie Hauck Walsh, *The Urban Challenge to Government*, *op. cit.*, p. 57.